

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00016895258



Class E415

Book .C6

Copyright N^o

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT

SELECTIONS

FROM THE

118
2462

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. CLINGMAN,

OF

NORTH CAROLINA,

WITH



ADDITIONS AND EXPLANATORY NOTES.



RALEIGH:

JOHN NICHOLS, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER, FAYETTEVILLE STREET.

1877.

SELECTIONS

E415

.6

C6

SPEECHES AND WRITINGS

HON. THOMAS L. CLINGMAN

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1877, by
THOMAS L. CLINGMAN,
in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

15-1940

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY,.....	5
RELIGIOUS AND POPULAR ORATORS,	23
ADDRESS DELIVERED AT DAVIDSON COLLEGE, NORTH CAROLINA,	39
THE GREAT METEOR OF 1860,.....	53
HUXLEY, DARWIN AND TYNDALL; OR, THE THEORY OF EVOLU- TION,.....	60
WATER SPOUTS,.....	68
VOLCANIC ACTION IN NORTH CAROLINA,.....	78
FARMING AND COOKERY,	84
ANNUAL ADDRESS BEFORE THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE AGRI- CULTURAL SOCIETY,.....	90
SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE CHARLOTTE CENTENNIAL,.....	110
THE MOUNTAIN REGION OF NORTH CAROLINA:	
LETTER TO J. S. SKINNER, Esq.,.....	113
LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE HIGHLAND MESSENGER,.....	116
LETTER FROM PROFESSOR CHARLES UPHAM SHEPARD,....	119
LETTER TO THE NORTH CAROLINA LAND COMPANY,	121
EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER TO WILLIAM FRAZIER, Esq.,.....	124
CLIMATE OF WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA, AND ITS HEALTHFULNESS FOR CONSUMPTIVES AND OTHERS,.....	126
OLD DIGGINGS FOR MICA IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA,	130
MOUNT PISGAH, NORTH CAROLINA,.....	133
MOUNTAIN SCENERY,	136
GUYOT'S MEASUREMENT OF THE MOUNTAINS OF WESTERN NORTH CARO- LINA,.....	138
THE PRINCIPLES OF THE WHIG AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES,.....	148
MR. CLAY--CAUSES OF HIS DEFEAT,.....	173
WILMOT PROVISIO,	196
POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE SLAVE QUESTION,.....	197
GENERAL TAYLOR AS A PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE,.....	226
JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND GENERAL TAYLOR,.....	227

MR. CALHOUN'S UNIONISM,.....	229
CLAYTON COMPROMISE,.....	230
ALARMING AGITATION AS TO SLAVERY,.....	230
CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOOTE AND MANGUM,.....	231
POSITION OF THE "NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER,".....	233
MR. TOOMBS' RESOLUTION IN WHIG CAUCUS,.....	234
DEFENCE OF THE SOUTH AGAINST THE AGGRESSIVE MOVEMENT OF THE NORTH,.....	235
MR. CLAY'S CONVERSATION AND CHARACTERISTICS,.....	254
COMPARISON OF CLAY AND WEBSTER,.....	255
MR. WEBSTER'S PECULIARITIES,.....	258
MR. MANGUM,.....	259
PROGRESS OF THE SLAVERY AGITATION, DISCUSSED IN A LETTER TO THE "REPUBLIC,".....	259
WM. B. SHEPARD'S VIEWS,.....	264
NASHVILLE CONVENTION, LETTER ON.....	268
HOWELL COBB AND BARNWELL RHETT,.....	270
CONTROVERSY OF STEPHENS, TOOMBS AND WEED,...	270
PRESIDENT TAYLOR AND MR. CLAY,.....	272
MR. CLAY'S BILL DEFEATED,.....	273
COMPROMISE OF 1850 PASSED,.....	274
FUTURE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT,.....	275
UNION PARTY, ATTEMPT TO FORM IT,.....	287
DUTIES ON RAILROAD IRON AND COMMERCIAL RESTRICTIONS,...	288
PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST—SCOTT, FILLMORE AND WEBSTER,.....	308
STRUGGLE IN WHIG CAUCUS—LETTER TO THE "REPUBLIC,".....	309
SCOTT'S NOMINATION—GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION TO HIM—LETTER TO DR. LADSON A. MILLS,.....	316
CAUSES OF SCOTT'S DEFEAT STATED,.....	323
SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES—KANSAS AND NEBRASKA,.....	334
SPEECH ON THE SAME,.....	336
EXCITEMENT GROWING OUT OF THE KANSAS BILL, AND DINNER TO JOHN KERR,.....	353
AMERICAN OR KNOW NOTHING MOVEMENT,.....	355
PUBLIC EXPENNDITURES,.....	356
MEDIATION IN THE EASTERN WAR,.....	363
FOREIGN POLICY—PANAMA AND BLACK WARRIOR CASES—ADMIN- ISTRATION REFUSES TO ACT,.....	375
CRAMPTON'S DISMISSAL,.....	376

BRITISH INTERFERENCE WITH SLAVERY,.....	377
GREAT BRITAIN AND EAST INDIAN TORTURES,.....	379
BRITISH POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND CUBA,.....	391
SPEECH AGAINST CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY,.....	409
SPEECH AGAINST PROTECTIVE TARIFFS,.....	432
KANSAS—WALKER, BUCHANAN AND DOUGLAS—CONTEST BE- TWEEN THE TWO LATTER,.....	449
CONTROVERSY BETWEEN DOUGLAS AND JUDGE BLACK,.....	450
JOHN BROWN'S RAID INTO HARPER'S FERRY,.....	451
SPEECH AGAINST THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT OF THE ANTI- SLAVERY PARTY,.....	451
CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY,.....	484
SPEECH AGAINST THAT MOVEMENT,.....	486
MR. DAVIS' RESOLUTIONS PASSED,.....	507
MOTIVES OF THE ACTORS,	507
BUCHANAN, SLIDELL, DAVIS,.....	508
FLOYD'S DISTRIBUTION OF ARMS IN THE SOUTH,....	510
IMPORTANCE OF THAT MOVEMENT,	512
DOUGLAS' PRESIDENTIAL CANVASS,.....	512
DEBATE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE,.....	514
ANDREW JOHNSON,.....	523
PRESIDENT BUCHANAN,	526
GENERAL SCOTT,	527
SPEECH ON THE STATE OF THE UNION,.....	528
BRITISH VIEWS OF THE SITUATION,....	550
LETTERS TO THOMAS, OSBORNE, AND OTHERS, ON THE SITUATION,	553
DEBATE ON LINCOLN'S INAUGURAL,	556
WAR POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION,.....	558
INCREDULITY ABOUT WAR,	563
SINGULAR FALLACY,	565
POPULAR DELUSIONS,	566
CONCLUSION OF THE SLAVERY DISCUSSION,	568
SCHEME OF NATIONAL CURRENCY,.....	574
LETTER ON THE SAME,	580
INTERVIEW WITH A "HERALD" CORRESPONDENT,	587
CAMPAIGN SPEECH AT HENDERSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA,....	593
PUBLIC SPEAKING—HOW IT OUGHT TO BE CONDUCTED, .	613
MODE OF CHOOSING A PRESIDENT, .	614
JOINT RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION,	620

777	BRITISH INTERESTS WITH SLAVERY
779	GREAT BRITAIN AND EAST INDIA PORTUGAL
781	BRITISH POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND GUATEMALA
783	SPAIN AGAINST PROTECTOR TARIFFS
785	KANSAS—WALKER, BOWMAN AND PORTLAND—TENTH
787	TWENTY TWO TWO LATER
789	CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES
791	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
793	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
795	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
797	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
799	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
801	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
803	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
805	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
807	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
809	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
811	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
813	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
815	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
817	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
819	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
821	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
823	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
825	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
827	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
829	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
831	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
833	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
835	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
837	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
839	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
841	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
843	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
845	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
847	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
849	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
851	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
853	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
855	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
857	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
859	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
861	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
863	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
865	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
867	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
869	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
871	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
873	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
875	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
877	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
879	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
881	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
883	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
885	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
887	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
889	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
891	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
893	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
895	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
897	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
899	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
901	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
903	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
905	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
907	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
909	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
911	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
913	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
915	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
917	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
919	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
921	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
923	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
925	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
927	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
929	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
931	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
933	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
935	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
937	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
939	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
941	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
943	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
945	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
947	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
949	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
951	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
953	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
955	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
957	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
959	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
961	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
963	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
965	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
967	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
969	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
971	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
973	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
975	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
977	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
979	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
981	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
983	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
985	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
987	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
989	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
991	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
993	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
995	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
997	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE
999	THE NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

INTRODUCTION.

The determination to make this publication was brought about by frequent calls on me for one or another of the articles embraced in it. Sometimes a gentleman has written to me for a copy of an address or lecture, which he wished to send to his son in college. Another person would ask for an article on a scientific subject, while many sought descriptions of portions of the mountainous regions of North Carolina. Politicians expressed a desire to have a copy of a particular speech which was remembered as having been made in one of the Houses of Congress.

Not being able otherwise to comply with such wishes, I decided to put a number of the articles sought for in the form of a book. To many of the Congressional speeches I have added explanatory remarks that will serve to indicate the condition of affairs which seemed to render such a speech necessary. Important facts can thus be made known, and additional interest be given to what was said. Earnest debates, presenting the prominent points at issue, being a part of the *res gesta*, with proper explanations of the conditions then existing, are far more interesting than any subsequent history, prepared as they usually are. It was the younger Pitt, I think, who said that he would rather have one of Bolingbroke's speeches as delivered than the lost books of Livy's great history.

The most important results are often produced by events known only to a few actors concerned in them, which no outsider will ever understand except through explanations made by those conversant with the transactions.

In making up the political portions of this publication, such matter only has been selected as may, in my judgment, throw light on points that are still interesting to the public.

In the selections it will be seen that there has been no effort to support any particular theory or line of policy. Nor is there any purpose to establish political consistency in the speaker. The only consistency worthy of consideration is consistency to a man's convictions. To be true to the principles recognized as important, is the only object to be desired.

Mere devotion to party, instead of being a merit, is a reproach to a statesman. In fact, no man ever did acquire the character of a statesman who was the mere devotee of a party. To assume, for example, that because a man in 1840 supported General Harrison as the nominee of the Whig party, he was thereby bound to vote for General Scott in 1852, or for Seward, Giddings or Lincoln in 1860, if thus nominated, would be scarcely less absurd than it would be to affirm that because the Mississippi river at its source was limpid, it must be equally clear at its mouth; or to insist that a man who was seen planting corn in April, was inconsistent because he did not continue planting it in December.

By the general judgment of those who knew him intimately, Mr. Clay was regarded as the most public-spirited and patriotic man of his time; and yet, I never knew a man who seemed to be more gratified by receiving applause, nor who appeared more anxious to win in whatever he undertook to accomplish. Nevertheless, whenever the public interest seemed to demand it, he did not hesitate to change his line of action. Repeatedly, in the course of a few weeks, he would modify his position on a most important issue. This, however, was always done to obtain what he deemed the greatest good that could be accomplished.

Again, I have often, when an important issue was presented to a man, heard him say, "this may be right, but I took ground last year against it before my people, and I cannot go for it now." Another would oppose it because in some former speech he had expressed a different opinion.

Such men, who were always looking back at their own tracks, struck me as being vastly more contemptible than the peacock, that, while it struts, seems to be gazing admiringly at its own tail. In fact, those

individuals who claim that they had never been able to discover new facts to modify their opinions, are universally regarded as the most conceited and stupid of mankind.

In the explanatory statements and notes which follow, I speak in the first person, for two reasons. Insincerity even in what is, perhaps, its most harmless form, affectation, is always disgusting to me. It is also futile, because subterfuges or stratagems to conceal egotism, only serve to render it more conspicuous, as the vanity of the Greek philosopher was seen the more plainly through the holes in his coat.

Again, speaking in the first person is not only more natural, but it also makes a narrative clearer and more interesting. No one regards Benjamin Franklin as especially vain, because he wrote, for publication, a narrative of his life in that style. Sir Samuel Baker's Journey up the White Nile is far more interesting than it would have been if written as histories usually are. When one speaks of what he saw or heard said, he necessarily represents himself as present, and, to some extent, a party to the transaction.

In what I may say, I shall endeavor to avoid repeating anything in the line of mere personal commendation or compliment. If, in some instances such things should be supposed to be intimated, it will, I think, be found that the purpose of the reference was to present some consideration, more or less instructive or interesting in itself, or to illustrate the character of some prominent actor.

With respect to transactions before the late civil war, I feel at liberty to speak with as much freedom of the conversations of persons in relation to public matters, as I would do with reference to the declarations of Julius Cæsar. The transactions of that period have been finished, and are now but the subject of history, and no man has a right to complain of references to his course on public questions, provided he is fairly represented as he then stood or spoke. On the contrary, if he expressed his real opinions, he ought to feel gratified by this reproduction and publication.

Most of what I shall state has either been made public in some mode, or is known to persons now living. If there are some exceptions, then those who are personally acquainted with me know that I

will not state as a fact anything, the accuracy of which I have any reason to doubt. Strangers will give such weight to my statements as they may think proper.

My purpose is to present important facts that may prove instructive, whether they may be deemed advantageous or hurtful to the reputations of individuals. If persons who write histories and biographies would speak with the same impartiality that the Bible manifests, such publications would not only be more truthful than they are, but they would be far more instructive. A fair examination or criticism of a man's life is much more interesting than a mere eulogy.

The first of these papers is intended for humanity; the second for the young men of the United States; and the third is addressed more particularly to the young men of North Carolina.

The miscellaneous articles which follow are arranged without reference to the time of their first publication, but rather in such succession as may be most agreeable to the reader.

The Congressional speeches of course follow in the order of their delivery, as that mode is best calculated to give a just idea of the current of events. The publication as a whole is presented in the hope that it may prove interesting and instructive to the young men of the country.

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED IN NEW YORK, WASHINGTON, RALEIGH, AND
AT OTHER POINTS.

By T. L. CLINGMAN.

The subject I am now about to present, was strikingly brought to my mind by a casual conversation in a law office in the city of Washington. A scientific and highly educated foreigner said that no scientific man in Europe believed in the truth of the Christian religion, and that any such person, by expressing a belief in its divine origin, would lose the respect of all men of science in that enlightened part of the world.

After hearing this remark, as I was passing to New York, on the next day, my reflections took the form I am now about to present. To show the relations existing between Modern Positive Science and Christianity, I will present a series of statements and propositions.

First, let it be supposed that an Esquimaux Indian has been brought to the city of New York in mid-winter. Having lived in the Arctic regions where no trees grow, he has only seen wood in the form of a spar from a ship, and been accustomed to regard it as a thing of the highest value. He is, therefore, greatly astonished at the number and size of the trees in the parks, and looks with wonder on their great trunks and leafless limbs. By one of those mishaps that sometimes occur, he is cast into prison, and remains closely immured for a long period.

At length he is released and walks abroad. It is now, however, mid-summer, and he is amazed with the change. The trees, all covered with the green foliage of the season, present their broad leaves to his gaze. Remembering their appearance in winter, the present scene seems like the work of magic.

He soon finds himself in the presence of an intelligent and dignified gentleman, a Professor in the University, and thoroughly instructed in all the sciences. Attracted by the intelligence and benevolence of his countenance, the Indian thus addresses him:

"Sir, I am an ignorant Esquimaux, just discharged from prison, and am greatly astonished with what I see around me. Will you allow me, sir, to ask you a few questions?"

"Certainly," replies the philosopher, "for I read your singular case in the papers this morning, and as it is now vacation in the college in which I am a Professor, I have ample leisure."

"How fortunate I am," exclaims the savage, "in meeting a most learned professor, who can explain, without effort, all that perplexes my ignorance. When I first saw these trees, in the winter, their limbs were all naked, while now they are covered with broad and beautiful green leaves. Is this not wonderfully strange?"

"Not in the least," answers the Professor; "on the contrary, it would be strange if they did not have leaves on them, for they are live trees, and all live trees put out leaves in the summer."

"What is a live tree?" says the Esquimaux.

"A live tree," replies the Professor, "is one which has a vital principle in it, that causes it to germinate in the spring, and put out young branches and leaves."

"Most learned Professor," exclaims the delighted savage, "what is that vital principle that produces such wonders as I behold?"

"Why, in fact," the Professor answers, "though science explains almost everything else, it does not disclose what that vital principle is. We only see the effects, but the cause is a hidden mystery."

"How unfortunate!" exclaims the Indian, with a look of disappointment, "that your great science, which explains everything else, should have failed in this, which seems the most wonderful of all. There are, however, other things which appear very strange, which I beg you to explain to me. During my long confinement, in cold weather they gave me a fire, and as I gazed on it, I often wondered what fire was. Do, my friend, as you can so easily, with the aid of your great science, tell me what fire is."

"Fire," answers the Professor, "is combustion attended with the extrication of light and heat."

"I am so ignorant," says the savage; "kind and learned Professor, do tell me what combustion is."

"Combustion," replies the Professor, "is the union of oxygen, which is a supporter of combustion, with the carbon and hydrogen in the fuel."

"But why does the oxygen unite with the carbon and hydrogen?" says the Esquimaux.

"That oxygen unites with these combustibles is a fact which is observed, but for which no cause can be assigned," answers the Professor.

"Then at least tell me," says the Indian, "what light and heat are, for as these things are extricated, and made manifest, your science can easily explain them."

"Light," replies the Professor, "has been the subject of so much investigation that its properties are now well understood. There is an exceedingly elastic medium which pervades all space, in which undulations are excited by the luminous body, which are propagated to the eye, and cause the perception of vision."

"How delighted I am," exclaims the poor savage, "to learn this; for in my own country when the sun, after so many months of darkness came back to us, and sent a great flood of light over our ices and snows, the beauty of its colors reflected on all sides caused me to dance for joy, and I thought how much I would give to understand what it was that made the scene so glorious. Little did I then hope that I should, in a distant land, meet with a great and learned Professor, who would explain it all to me. Tell me now what is that elastic medium which performs such wonders."

"Science," answers his companion, "does not tell us what that medium is, we only recognize its effects."

"You cannot tell what it is, you say," answers the Indian; "then how do you know that there is any such medium at all?"

"We have no positive knowledge of its existence, but as light is perceived and must have a cause, we can account for what we observe in no other manner than to suppose that there must be a medium of the elasticity and properties necessary to cause the effects we perceive."

Hereupon the Esquimaux burst into a fit of laughter, on recovering from which he said: "Do not imagine, most learned Professor, that I laughed from any want of respect for you, but because your last remark brought to my mind something that happened when I was in prison. I had heard for some time a singular noise above my head, and I asked the man who waited on my cell, if he could tell me the cause of it. "Yes," said he, "there is something up there making a noise." "What is it," I enquired, "is it a man or a dog, or a cat or a rat?" "I don't know what it is," he answered, "but I expect there is something up there which makes the noise." "But do you know that there is anything up there?" I said. "No, I don't," he replied, "but if there is something up there, it could make a noise." Now I laughed, most learned Professor, at the folly of the man who ought merely to have said that he did not know the cause of the noise. Your saying that you did not know that there was a medium which propagated light, but that if there was one possessing certain qualities, it might do it, brought, I know not how, into my mind, the conversation I had with the silly clown."

"But as light, like the vital principle in the trees, is not explained by science, tell me at least what heat is? for that is so familiar and seemingly so near to my feelings, that it will be more easily explained."

The Professor, not without manifesting some signs of impatience, answered: "The old philosophers used to speak of heat as one of the imponderable elements of nature."

"Imponderable; that means it has no weight," said the savage, "but this only makes it more obscure, for if it had weight, I should know one thing about it."

The Professor proceeded: "Tyndall, in a most profound scientific work, has shown that heat is in all cases the equivalent of a certain amount of motion."

"Equivalent, you say, to motion," quickly said the Esquimaux; "ah, that reminds me of what I heard this morning as I came along. One man asked another what he had been doing last year, and the other

answered, that his work had been equivalent to five hundred dollars. As I came along, I said to myself, did he make ten suits of clothes, worth fifty dollars each, or a hundred hats, or did he work on a farm, or at the printing business, and for my life I could not tell what the man had been doing all last year. So that when I am told that heat is equivalent to motion, still I do not know what it is."

"The pain I now feel causes me to ask you to explain something else. An hour ago, while I was looking at one of the stones with which they were paving the street, I carelessly let it slip out of my hand, and it instantly went down to my foot with such force that I feel the pain even yet. Professor, do tell me what caused the stone to go with such violence against my foot."

"That," said the Professor, with a serious look, "was caused by the force of gravity."

"And what is the force of gravity?" said the Indian.

"It is the attractive force which each particle of matter exerts on every other particle, and extends throughout the entire universe, keeping every planet and comet in its proper place, and influencing all material things."

"It is most wonderful!" exclaims his auditor. "Tell me what that attractive force is that is so mighty in its effects."

"You ask me," said the Professor, "what it is beyond the power of science to answer. The universal fact is perceived, but nothing more is, or can be known."

"Then," sorrowfully responds the savage, "all your great science tells me only such things as I can see for myself, but it does not explain what I am most anxious to know. When in my own country I felt the warm glow of the fire, and saw the brilliant light which the great sun cast over the world, I longed to know the cause of these things. Our prophets said that the Great Spirit, by his secret but mighty power that pervaded all space, caused the results daily exhibited. But your science does not tell me how any of these effects are produced. There must be a cause for all these appearances, and as your science shows none, I will go back to the ideas of my ignorant barbarism."

Such is, indeed, all human science! Whatever be the subject it takes hold of, before it moves far in one direction its course is arrested, and it fails to elucidate what it is most anxious to know. Like a fly in a glass jar, in whatever direction it may start, its progress is soon arrested.

I will now present a second scene for consideration.

There was, last evening, a great gathering of the worms at a locality near us. By worms, I mean such as are found in the moist earth, usually called red worms. The meeting was the annual assemblage of their Association for the Advancement of Science, and the occasion derived unusual interest from its being known that some important questions, about which there had long been a difference of opinion, were to be discussed and settled.

The questions were whether certain Englishmen had built of iron a ship called the "Great Eastern," six hundred and eighty feet long. Secondly, whether the Emperor of Germany could bring together a million of armed men. And thirdly, whether the citizens of the United

States had constructed a railroad from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean, more than three thousand miles long. The fact known that these questions were to be discussed and settled, attracted an unusually large concourse of scientific worms.

There was an especial desire to hear the views of a certain venerable and distinguished philosopher, who had published a work on the universe, so learned and comprehensive that it was a common opinion that the portion of science which he did not know was, in fact, not worth knowing. He was especially noted for his extensive travels, it being asserted that he had traveled at least twenty times his own length, and therefore, as he was six inches long, he had probably traveled in his life not less than one hundred and twenty inches, or ten feet.

On this occasion he arose only after the debate had already taken a wide range, and his exposition of his views was so lucid, and at the same time so logical and accurate, that he carried conviction to the mind of every hearer. He declared that in all his extensive travels he had never seen a ship of any size whatever, and that the existence of one so prodigious as the Great Eastern, was not more probable than that of the gorgons and hydras, invented by the fertile imaginations of the Greeks.

As to the second question about a million of men, he did not believe there had ever been a single man in existence. The jarring of the earth over their heads sometimes, which the ignorant believed to be caused by the tread of a man above, was doubtless due to an earthquake, while the upturning of immense masses of earth at times, so detrimental to many worms, instead of being, as popularly supposed, the effect of a plow in the hands of a man, was rather to be attributed to some convulsion of nature, not yet understood, but which science would, doubtless one of these days, be able to take hold of and explain.

As to the third proposition, if there were no men, of course no railroad three thousand miles long had ever been built by them. After this most convincing and luminous address by the great philosopher, it was unanimously decided that the existence of man was as improbable as that of the genii of eastern romance; that all of the propositions should be rejected as absurdities, and that any one maintaining a different opinion would forfeit the respect of all scientific worms.

How much was this decision worth as an element in determining the truth of the three propositions discussed? I maintain that it ought to be considered as of quite as much value in that respect as are the teachings of science explained after the manner of the positive philosophers of the present day, in deciding the questions which I am about to present.

But it will, perhaps, be said that there is no analogy whatever between the cases, and that the worms could not have any data to rest their decision upon. This is admitted, but I merely affirm, that they might be able to make greater progress in the pursuit of the facts necessary in their case, than can the positivists through their systems in acquiring a knowledge even of the material universe.

The star Sirius is so near us that it is estimated that its rays of light reach the earth in twelve years. If one of these worms were able to

travel two inches in twenty-four hours, he might pass over a distance of more than fifty feet in a year, make one mile in a century, and in five hundred thousand years he would have passed over a distance of five thousand miles. This distance would carry him to Southampton, where I saw the Great Eastern, or even to Berlin, in Germany.

But if a man could travel towards Sirius at the rate of one thousand miles per day, a distance which no man has probably ever passed over in twenty-four hours, he would be traveling two hundred millions of years before he reached the star, or four hundred times longer than the period necessary, to enable the worm to complete his journey. With respect to the comparative length of their lives, the worm would be quite as likely to live one year as the man four hundred, such being the proportions between the length of their journeys.

It may be said, however, that such an obstacle as the Atlantic ocean would positively prevent the journey of the worm. This is admitted, but a still more formidable one bars the way of the man to the star. The worm might make a considerable progress in his journey, but no man has ever gotten ten miles from the earth, or probably ever can.

Herschell discovered stars two thousand times more distant than Sirius, and did not regard even this space as indicating the extent of the material universe. Even of a body comparatively so near us as the sun, the little we know of it, only seem to perplex us. For if as the spectrum analysis teaches us, the heat there is so great that iron, and other like substances, are kept in the condition of incandescent gasses, of what materials are the solid body of the sun composed, and of what substance and fashion are its inhabitants formed? For when we perceive that here upon the earth a single cubic inch of slate has contained more than forty millions of living animals, we hesitate to believe that a body more than twelve hundred thousand times larger than our whole globe, should be absolutely destitute of living beings.

The worm, too, might possibly by contact with a railroad bar, or by touching the side of a ship, learn something of it, but if this star be like our sun, as it is generally conceded, then no man could approach within a distance of several millions of miles of it without his body being converted into gasses by its heat.

It may be suggested that as man is furnished with organs of vision, he possesses a great advantage over the worm. But if man's vision gives him so imperfect a knowledge of the material world, how is it to be assumed that it can afford him any knowledge of spiritual existences? Is he not blind in this respect?

But it may be objected that if man's senses do not enable him to perceive spirits, what evidence have we that such exist. This question brings me to the third proposition in our progress.

If man's senses do not positively or directly perceive spirits, how can he know that such things are realities?

The maintenance of this affirmative proposition is more difficult than was the negation of the two preceding ones.

I believe it can be as fairly and as satisfactorily established as are other propositions regarded as certain in philosophical science.

For example, I have a settled belief, a thorough conviction that spiritual beings exist. This feeling seems to be a part of my nature, so that I cannot remember its origin. But if this belief were mine alone, it would be regarded as an illusion entitled to no more weight than the fancy of an insane person. A similar conviction, however, pervades the minds of the whole human race. The feeling is not confined to the men of my own country, nor even to those of what is called the civilized world. All barbarians, all savages, living either in the remotest continental localities, or the least frequented islands of the ocean possess the same conviction. The chief difference observed between the savage and the civilized man seems to be that the feeling in the former is, if not stronger, at least more controlling than it is in the latter. This conviction of the existence of spiritual beings antedates all history, and seems to have influenced the conduct of mankind in every age.

It is idle to say that this is a mere fancy, for mental conditions are as real and their existence may be established by evidence as conclusive as are the material objects of which our senses directly take cognizance. For example, if a question were raised as to whether a music teacher could play a tune, or only make a noise on his violin, if he were to play a familiar air in this assembly, most persons here present would be able to swear with as much confidence that he had played a tune, as that he had held an instrument in his hand.

In other words, we are convinced that a tune faculty exists in the mind. In like manner we know that there are such things as love and anger, though our senses do not directly perceive them. But the faculty of spirituality, or the belief in the existence of spiritual beings, is not less strikingly manifested.

Superficial writers have said that the belief in the existence of spirits was prevalent, because it was early taught to children by nurses and others. A nurse in the fable threatens to throw a crying child to the wolf, but if all nurses habitually did this, is it believed that grown up men in countries where it was known that no wolves existed, would ever feel such terror as ghostly fear inspires? Nurses speak of these things because they feel them strongly, and they impress the minds of children because they are in harmony with their natures.

Though thousands should write of the vanity of love and the folly of anger, yet these feelings would continue to be recognized as a part of human nature. Education can no more easily eradicate a mental faculty, than it could produce one, which nature had not created. If the faculty of spirituality did not exist, man would no more have conceived the idea of spirits than if all mankind were destitute of organs of vision, could they ever have entertained the idea of color.

Spirituality being one of the most important elements of man's nature, like his other faculties, manifests itself in children. In after life these feelings continue in the courageous as well as the timid. The bravest soldiers and sailors constitute no exception. It proves nothing that these emotions are often suppressed. All men dread the pain which wounds produce, but this dread is so subdued that they march into battle by the hundred thousand.

There is another condition of the human mind to be considered in this connection, viz: that quality which obliges it to assign a cause for what it sees. The feeling, or faculty, of causality is one of the strongest intellectual conditions of the mind. If I should chance to meet on the wayside a farmer of ordinary intelligence, and our conversation should take a scientific turn, I might say to him that the absolutely certain or exact sciences, like mathematics, rested on axioms or self-evident propositions. If I should ask him whether it was not true that the whole was equal to all its parts, and that things that were equal to the same thing were not necessarily equal to each other, he would, after a moment's reflection, probably admit that these propositions must be true.

"Then," I might say to him, "do you believe that stone made itself?" as I pointed to a water-worn lump of quartz in the road. He would instantly reply, "No, that stone never made itself." "Are you as sure about that as you are about the truth of the axioms?" "Yes, more so," would perhaps be the reply, "for I had to study a little about your axioms, but as to that stone I am just as sure it never made itself as I am that I see it."

Every human mind has a conviction that there was a cause for the material things it observes, and that the prime cause was some power of a nature different from the substances themselves. The conviction is universal that matter did not originate itself.

But the positive philosopher says you have no right to assume a cause, for you do not know what the cause is, nor have you positive evidence of its existence. I reply to him, "Then on your own principles you have no right to assume that there is an elastic medium through which light is propagated, for you neither know what it is, nor do you perceive its existence." He answers, "Light is apparent, self-evident, and it is necessary to account for it that we assume the existence of a medium." "I admit this, but if it be necessary to assume the existence of an element pervading all space to account for color alone, how much greater is the necessity to assign a cause for the existence of the whole material creation, which all our senses alike concur in perceiving?"

There is another condition or habit of the mind to be considered in this connection, viz: the impression that when things have uniformly existed together, they will not be found separated. Though this conviction is not so palpable as the former one, yet it is of such force that men of science base certain laws of uniformity on it. Let us measure its strength by comparing it with such testimony as men rely on in courts of justice.

A certain scientific Professor (the same person who had the conversation with the Esquimaux Indian) went to the fish market and enquired for a fresh shad. "Here is one," says a man at his stall, "taken out of the water last night." A bystander exclaims, "Professor, do not believe this lying fishmonger, that shad never came out of the water at all, it grew on a tree in the Central Park; you may there see them in great numbers hanging by their tails on the oak trees, and when the wind blows they fall off, and this man fills his basket every morning." The dealer retorts angrily, "That impudent fellow speaks falsely, Pro-

fessor; though I did not take the fish myself I know who did. He is an honest man, and rather than have my word disputed, I will induce him to go up to the City Hall, and he will there be qualified before the commissioner of affidavits, and swear positively that the fish did come out of the water."

"Give yourself no trouble," the amused Professor would say, "for I am as well satisfied that this fish came out of the water and did not grow on a tree as if ten of the best men in New York had sworn to the fact!"

When the Professor has reached the upper part of the city, he is accosted by workmen engaged in leveling the ground.

"Professor, we have found something very strange here, do tell us what it is!"

The Professor, after examining the object, pronounces it a fossil fish. "How can that possibly be Professor, for we found it thirty feet below the surface, and have blasted the rock above it. If that was ever a fish it must have been before Columbus discovered America."

"Yes," answers the Professor, "it was millions of years ago."

"Then, Professor, do you suppose there was any water existing that long ago?"

"Yes, plenty of it."

"But how, Professor, can you know that so many years before you were born?"

"See," said the Professor, "this animal had no legs to walk with, and he had no wings to fly, but he has fins and scales, and I am just as well satisfied that he lived in the water as I am that this shad did, and I told the man who sold it to me, that I felt quite as sure that it had lived in the water, as if ten men had sworn it."

"Professor, see he has something like an eye."

"Certainly," continues the Professor, "he had eyes."

"Then, Professor, do you suppose that there was any light that long ago?"

"Yes," answered the philosopher, "light existed then, the fish had eyes, nature makes nothing in vain, and would not have given it eyes without providing light for them."

Such is the decision of philosophy. It affirms that nature would not disappoint the eye of a reptile, or fail to furnish light for its use. But, while providing objects to gratify all the wants of the lower animals, and giving even to man what all his other faculties and passions require, it failed to make any provision for the exercise of strong feelings that pervade his nature, and control his actions, from infancy to old age, in every clime, and in every condition of his existence!

Sooner than this, I would adopt the philosophy of the little girl, who when the great meteor of July, 1860, was passing across the sky and persons were wondering what it was, said: "Mother, perhaps it is a great angel flying by!" She possibly had heard that on the morning of the resurrection, a mighty angel had descended in the midst of a great earthquake, and had rolled away the stone from the sepulchre, and sat on it with a countenance like lightning, and raiment white as

snow. If so, the words had fallen on a heart fitted to receive such impressions, and it spontaneously made this exclamation.

Mental and moral emotions produce on the mind of man greater impressions than any exhibition of mere material forces, however vast they may be. When the Roman poet exclaims, "*et cuncta terrarum subacta præter atrocem animam Catonis*," our minds are exalted by the contemplation of a great soul, erect and unsubdued, while the whole earth bowed before a conqueror—a conqueror, whose fate inspired the noble words:

“Look then abroad through nature, to the range
Of planets, suns, and adamantine spheres,
Wheeling unshaken through the void immense;
And speak, O man! does this capacious scene
With half that kindling majesty dilate
Thy strong conception, as when Brutus rose
Refulgent from the stroke of Cæsar's fate,
Amid the crowd of patriots; and his arm
Aloft extending like eternal Jove,
When guilt brings down the thunder, called aloud,
On Tully's name, and shook his crimson steel,
And bade the father of his country hail!
For lo! the tyrant prostrate in the dust,
And Rome again is free!”

Grand as are such emotions, they are inferior in depth and strength and universality to spiritual and religious enthusiasm. This, called into action, overrides all else, and carries the minds of men onward with irresistible force. To a king, about to enter into battle, who seeing the adverse army suddenly kneeling in prayer before him, exclaims: See! “they yield;” it is answered—

“Aye; but they bend to higher powers,
And other pardon sue than ours
Upon the spot where they have kneeled,
These men will die or win the field!”

The conviction that there is a power beyond all the material elements around him, which created and controls all things, pervades the mind of man universally, and is stronger and more palpable than his belief in any axiom that science has ever pointed out. It is broader than the whole surface of the earth, deeper than its foundations, and higher and more enduring than those starry worlds that stud the celestial firmament.

If then science, fairly interpreted, declares the existence of a spiritual cause for the material creation, does it indicate the character and purposes of such a being?

Man looks on the solid globe of the earth, considers its immense magnitude, its broad plains, its long mountain chains, rising above the clouds, its great rivers and seemingly boundless ocean, its storms and volcanoes, and the terrific earthquakes which shake its surface into vast fragments; and then casts his eyes upward to the rolling planets and countless suns, which spangle the boundless ethereal space,

and overwhelmed with the impression that the power which created all this must be vast beyond his conceptions of magnitude, he proclaims this power omnipotent.

Again, he sees that this was not the work of power alone, but that there has been joined with it intelligence and system. He examines a small insect, and while considering its minute structure, is astonished to see a manifestation of skill far surpassing the work of any human artificer. Then he observes the larger operations of nature, and the wonderful order in which they are conducted, not only on the earth, but in the motions of the heavenly bodies. The phenomena of nutation and the precession of the equinoxes in their long but regular periods, the movements of cometary and nebular masses, and the motions of the stars, fill him with amazement, and he recognizes the fact that infinite wisdom has been combined with omnipotent power.

What is the third great attribute or quality indicated by the consideration of these facts?

Had there been several creative agencies, then the law of Jupiter might have differed from that of Neptune or Pluto, and in the conflict of their several jurisdictions, jarring elements and chaotic conditions would exist in the border regions. We see, however, not only uniformity of law in the earth itself, but when we consider the effect of the sun's light and heat on the earth's animal and vegetable inhabitants, and the order of its seasons, we know that the power which created the earth also formed the sun and gave uniformity of laws to our whole planetary system.

But far away, immeasurably beyond the limits to which our remotest comet goes, the motions of the binary stars show us that in their revolutions around each other, they are governed by the same law of gravity that prevails on the earth. More wonderful and interesting still is our perception that the light which comes from the most distant stars and nebulae, is identical in its character with that which reaches us from the sun and other luminous objects near us. It consists of the same seven colors, and in like manner is reflected, refracted, dispersed, and polarized. It teaches us, too, by the spectrum analysis, that a number of the elements in the remotest stars and nebulous masses are identical with those existing in the earth. When, therefore, the boundless extent of the law of gravity is considered, and the identity of the light and other elements existing in the remotest regions of observed space is seen, we know that our Creator divides power with none, but reigns alone throughout the entire visible creation.

What is the fourth quality or attribute that science discovers in the creative power? When man considers his own person, he is struck with the fitness of his organs to serve his purposes, and administer to his wants. Were his eyes located in the soles of his feet, their value would be greatly diminished; if his teeth were set in a row across his forehead, they would be useless; if his beard grew on the inside of his throat instead of the outside, he would be suffocated early in life. When he looks abroad over the earth and sees the provision made for his comfortable existence, as well as that of the rest of the animal creation, or is struck by the beauty of the landscape before him, the

emerald hues of which are variegated by myriads of vernal flowers, or beholds the crimson and gold of its gorgeous sunsets, he cannot fail to recognize the fact that benevolence has been manifested by the creative power. All nations, whether civilized or barbarous, recognize the goodness of their divinities, and from time to time give thanks to them.

In the fifth place I call your attention to another quality, or purpose manifested in the condition of the material world. Though the system around us is in many respects excellent, yet it is not one of optimism. We readily see that it might have been so arranged as to have been far better suited to our wants. The human eye is inferior to the owl's in the darkness, and to that of the eagle in the sunlight. A grain of sand or the point of a thorn may destroy it, and its powers begin to fail, while man is in other respects in full vigor. His teeth are liable to be broken or worn away. He asks why did not an omnipotent and All-wise Creator make my teeth at least as hard as the diamond, and as tough as gum elastic, so that they would neither have been broken nor worn away? Why does my body fail while my mind is vigorous?

The answer to these questions is not difficult.

When I am told that a most skilful architect has erected an edifice, and on examining it I find it built of plates of ice, I decide at once, that it was intended to be a mere play-thing, to endure only until the summer's sun dissolved it. Had he intended it to be a permanent edifice, as he is a most skilful worker in granite, he would have used that material, having an abundance of the substance on hand.

So when a philosophic mind considers the physical nature of man, and the elements around him, all regarded as the work of an All-wise and Omnipotent Creator, it decides that man was placed on this earth for a temporary purpose.

A sixth great consideration forces itself on the mind. To enjoy even a temporary existence, effort is necessary on his part. He sees that the lillies do not toil, nor the oyster labor for its subsistence, and he asks why does not the earth spontaneously bear food for me as abundantly as it does the leaves on the trees? Why do not streams of milk and honey and wine flow like water? Why are the seasons often so uncomfortable, and why are not raiment and houses provided? It is a most palpable conclusion that man was placed on the earth to be a laborer!

In the seventh place man is distinguished by his moral emotions. He possesses a sense of right and wrong, what we term conscience, one of the deepest feelings of his nature.

So important is this element in the nature of man that we will pause to consider it a moment. A young man, exhausted by a long walk, is seen returning home with a gun on his shoulder. His mother perceiving his wearied appearance, hastens to meet him at the door with a refreshing draught, exclaiming: "My son, you look so tired; I have here for you to drink what you like best." He replies by presenting his gun and discharging it into her breast, and as she falls, looks on to see how long it will be before she dies.

Will this strike the human mind as wrong ? Or will the casuist suggest that the perception of wrong rises from the consideration that the mother will no longer be able to confer benefits, and that the son will thus be a loser ? Then we will reverse the picture.

On arriving at the banks of a stream I observe a mother preparing the clothes of the family. Something arrests my attention, and I exclaim to her : " Madam, your little daughter has fallen into the water, but fortunately she has caught hold of an overhanging limb and is sustaining her face above the water. You can hear her cries, ' Mother ! mother ! oh, mother ! ' " The lady looks in the direction I point, and sees her daughter's little hands clinging to the limb she has grasped and still keeping her head above the water. Will the mother say, " This child gives me a great deal of trouble ; she annoys me night and day ; and she puts me to expense, too, for though her feet are very little, yet her shoes and stockings cost something. Even if I were to hire some one to take care of her, I should have to pay more than fifty dollars a year. Upon the whole I shall be fortunate to-day if I get rid of her. " If, instead of speaking thus, she should, with a piercing appeal for help, rush into the water at the peril of her own life to save her child, would the feeling that she ought to do this be as decided in her mind as her belief in the axioms of the mathematician ? Will it be denied that such emotions are an essential element in man's nature ?

But as I move onward in my journey, I find a little boy of half a dozen years of age, with a sister still younger. He says to me, " Sir, I have been trying for a long while by throwing, to get some of those apples, but I cannot ; will you please sir, as you can so easily from your horse, get one for me and one for my little sister ? " I look at him and see a coin fastened around his neck by a string. Will I say to him, " If you will give me that piece of money, which does you no good, I will hand you down the apples ? " Or better still, seeing that there is no one in sight, and remembering that I am not to return by that road, I dismount, tear the coin from his neck by force and ride onward. Will not such an act necessarily strike the human mind as a criminal one ? But it may be said that there are men in the world who could commit such a crime. So there are men born blind, and others who by accident or disease have become so ; but does any one deny that vision or the faculty of sight is one of the elements of human nature ? It is not more impossible for the human eye to fail to perceive that snow and charcoal are of different colors, than it is that man should not distinguish moral right from wrong.

Man may destroy his external organs, he may even obliterate some of his mental faculties, but a life of vice and crime does not eradicate his conscience. With the grasp of an iron hand, it wrings the heart and shakes the soul of the dying criminal.

The emotions which conscience excites are peculiar and readily distinguishable from all other sensations. While these impulses and feelings rather seem to draw him along, or impel him to act, conscience appears to command, and sits in judgment over all the faculties. It acts on the savage with a force as imperative as it does on the civilized man. A number of the barbarous tribe of Santal in India,

taken prisoners during an insurrection, were allowed to go free, merely on their parole, to a distant spot, to work for wages. After a time they were obliged to leave on account of the cholera, but every one of these two hundred savages walked back to prison with his earnings, rather than break his word. A thousand similar instances might be appealed to.

The violation of conscience gives rise to sensations unlike any of our other feelings. If a banker has sustained a serious loss in a speculation he is grieved, but should he fraudulently transfer this loss to another, with whose funds he had been intrusted, the pain of mind subsequently felt, is wholly unlike that of ordinary grief. Even when a little child secretly violates its mother's command, though it knows discovery impossible, and therefore dreads no punishment, still remorse is felt. The sorrow of an innocent man who mourns the death of a friend, is as unlike as possible the emotion of the criminal who has secretly murdered one. Conscientious feelings are directly connected with the sense, or faculty of spirituality. There is ever an impression, it may be mysterious and vague, that a spiritual power will punish wrong. Nothing so utterly unmans one as the sense of crime. In the language of the great poet, conscience makes cowards of all men. No material barriers seem sufficient by their protecting influence to make the criminal feel secure. In spite of walls of stone, and bars of iron, awake, he trembles to be alone, asleep, shadows strike terror to his soul. Eclipses fill the minds of barbarians with awe, not that evil has ever been directly experienced from them, but because they are regarded as menaces of a spiritual power.

On the other hand, nothing animates man with such fortitude as the conviction that he is in the right, and the belief that divine power will fight on his side. That people, whose courage acquired for them the appellation of "the men of iron," appeared to the Greek, Polybius, the most superstitious of mankind. And yet he attributed their greatness to the fact that they consulted their gods on all occasions, however trivial. He declared that the word of a Roman was worth more than the bond of ten Greeks with twenty witnesses.

The sense of accountability to a spiritual being seems to be a part of human nature itself, and is usually connected with the belief that this accountability extends beyond the present life. The civilized men of our day, the enlightened heathens of antiquity, and all the barbarous nations alike manifest the conviction, that there is a future state of existence, in which rewards and punishments are to be meted out. Among many savage tribes the custom prevails of burying with their dead articles of the greatest value, to be used in a future state. Sometimes when a chief dies, they slay a number of his attendants, that he may in the next life be waited on by those most familiar with his wants.

The old African slaves, imported into this country, had an absolute faith that when they died they would return to their native homes in Africa.

The Europeans, who first explored this continent, found the American Indians possessed of a strong conviction of their immortality, and

of the existence of a spirit land, in which the good were to be rewarded and the bad punished.

While the famished Esquimaux has pictured before him a heaven with various platforms, distinguished by the superior quality of the viands in the higher stages, the inhabitant of the temperate regions sees in the future boundless hunting grounds, filled with game, and the resident of the tropics anticipates sensual delights. This very diversity proves that such a belief is not the effect of any cunningly devised fable, handed down through successive generations, but that it is the result of a deeply seated faculty of the heart, which acts directly on the intellect, and like the other strong passions, produces in the mind images calculated to satisfy its longings.

If then it be an essential principle of man's nature, the conviction that he is accountable for his actions to some spiritual power, both here and in a future existence, that power being the omnipotent unity indicated, must be the supreme moral Judge of the universe.

It has been argued that science does not furnish evidence of a personal God. When the action of the force of gravity is observed it strikes the mind as being an inanimate or dead force. Plants exhibit a certain vitality. In animals of the higher order, we observe feeling, perception or intelligence, the capacity to judge, and will to direct and modify their action in accordance with their desires, fears or passions. In addition to these man exhibits high sentiments, moral emotions, sense of duty or obligation, directed by conscience, spirituality, devotion, or reverence for a Deity, and a conviction of accountability to Him throughout an immortal existence, which give force and direction to his diversified intellectual perceptions. To assume that the Creator could give to man all these faculties without being able to possess them himself, involves an absurdity as great as the human mind can conceive. Man cannot imagine the existence of these intellectual and moral qualities without connecting them with personal existence. The conviction is so overwhelmingly strong that no argument or evidence can add to its force. Nor have men existed in any community without regarding their divinities as beings invested with personal existence.

Greater and more imposing than all else is the idea of endless duration, impressed on the mind by the contemplation of the material universe. All the objects around us seem perishable, but in fact they are only subject to change and never to annihilation. Geological science shows us a succession of changes in the earth, requiring for their consummation a period of time so great that the mind is bewildered when it attempts to look back through the long vista of past ages, in a vain search for the beginning of things, and encounters ideas so vague and shadowy that reason seems to stagger in their presence.

Again, when science shows us that the earth has not grown sensibly colder in two thousand years, we ask, how long a period will elapse before it loses its vital heat and becomes, what the smaller moon appears, a dead planet? Or may it not be true that its mass is such, compared with its surface, that now its radiation retarded by its at-

mosphere, is just equal to the amount of heat that it annually receives from the sun?

The mind is carried forward still in this line of thought, when it looks upward to the celestial bodies, and considers their structure and movements. A day doubtless seems a long period to the animalculæ, which exists only for a few hours. A year is long to a child, while to the mind of man the twenty-five thousand years, in which the equinoxes, in their precession, make one revolution, seems an immense period. But why, science asks, should not these revolutions be continued until their numbers are equal to all the past revolutions of our earth about the sun? The sun itself is moving with all its planets through space, possibly around some remote centre. In what immense period will it make one of its circuits, and is it thus to move on until its cycles shall have been as numerous as up to the present time have been all the earth's diurnal revolutions upon its own axis?

Some of the distant nebulae are regarded by astronomers as masses of cosmical vapor, or star dust, out of which new suns are to be formed. How long will it be before these suns are completed with their attendant planets, and what period must elapse before those planets, at first incandescent masses, are sufficiently cooled to become, like our earth, habitable worlds? And are these new suns, with those already created, to move on in their great cycles forever and forever? Philosophic science indicates no termination to the material universe. And if it is to exist forever, why should not its great Creator be eternal? Is He less than the work of His hands? Have we any reason to suppose that His power to-day is not as great as it was in the dawn of creation? Vast and incomprehensible as is the idea of eternity, science can point us to no other conclusion.

Are not then these eight attributes and principles fairly and necessarily deduced from a thoroughly scientific examination of the material world? Can sound philosophy hesitate to accept them as true? How then do the doctrines of Christianity harmonize with these deductions? From the announcement in the beginning of Genesis, that "God said let there be light and there was light," to the closing passages of Revelation, the Bible everywhere portrays in the most striking and splendid language, the omnipotent power and infinite wisdom of the Creator. In comparison, how puerile are the gods of Homer, magnified as they were by the greatest imagination of all antiquity? Two or three chapters in the book of Job convey to the mind higher ideas of omnipotent power and infinite wisdom, than all ever uttered by profane writers. Nor is the unity of the Creator less strikingly manifested throughout the Bible. He ever there stands alone, tolerating no rival. His benevolence, or merciful goodness, is proclaimed on every page. So too is man's fleeting existence declared, and he is likened to the grass that is green to-day, to be consumed to-morrow, to the shadow that passes over the earth, and leaves no trace of its existence.

In the sixth place, we are told that man was especially created to till the ground, and after his transgression he was condemned to live by the sweat of his brow. This beautiful analogy presents itself too. As the good things of this world are not thrust upon man, but he is com-

pelled to labor in order that he may possess and enjoy them, so, will not spiritual good be forced upon him. He is told that he must strive to enter in at the straight gate; that the violent take the Kingdom of Heaven by force; that he must fight against the great adversary, the Prince of this world; and, as men contend for the fading laurels of earth, so must he struggle to win a crown undimmed by time or even eternity itself.

But if there be one feature of the Bible which may be considered as paramount to all others, it is the manner in which the moral law is proclaimed. God's perfect justice, His absolute holiness, and man's accountability for his conduct to Him through time and eternity, are set forth in a manner so pre-eminently striking as to indicate this as the chief purpose of biblical revelation.

A most remarkable feature of the Bible is the truthfulness of its presentation of human nature. Man in his books ever flatters himself, but strip him of the paraphernalia with which his pride and vanity invest him, as in times of great trial in sieges and shipwrecks, when his inmost nature is made manifest, and the multitude stand out before us in the character in which the Old Testament depicts humanity. So unlike, too, to all previously written are the gospels, that they extorted from Napoleon on the island of St. Helena, the exclamation that their divinity was so palpable that it overwhelmed him.

To the awe and terror of previous systems the New Testament adds the great elements of benevolence, love, humanity, charity. It announces a Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, which communes directly with the human heart. Though for the first time proclaimed, it is in harmony with the deep mysterious feeling of man's nature, as shadowed forth possibly in such declarations as that of Socrates, the noblest of heathen philosophers, who declared that a good spirit directed him through life. Though this Spirit will not always strive with man, yet it returns to him with renewed appeals.

But the Positive Philosopher asks if it is not unjust that men should be punished eternally for such offenses as they commit in this life. His philosophy answers this question. Let him look to the material world around him, the physical and organic laws of which he prides himself on knowing. His arm is crushed off and his eyes are put out. Will these injuries be permanent? In his anguish he asks, am I thus forever to be punished for one thoughtless act, the work of but a single moment? "Yes, yes, your arm is gone forever; never, never more will your eyes behold the beautiful light." If then the moral law should, in like manner, inflict eternal punishment for crimes against it, is it not in exact harmony with the physical law, the uniformity which the philosopher boasts that he has discovered? If, however, it could be said to him, "Here is a remedy, which will give you back your right hand, and restore your sight," with what a bound would he not spring forward to secure that remedy! No human skill, no law of nature will ever restore to him these members. But the Christian system, higher than the earthly law, holds out this remedy, through its plan of atonement, and by contrast with former suffering, man's enjoyment will be increased a thousand fold.

It does seem to me that if all the men of science, in grand convention assembled, were to proclaim the great principles fairly established by the contemplation of the material universe, they could not do it more accurately and strikingly than they are presented by Christianity.

Persons sometimes ask why is it, if the Bible be the Word of God, that certain things are left unexplained and obscure. For every mystery in the Bible an hundred can be found in nature. Science cannot explain electricity or magnetism, or light or heat, or attraction and repulsion, or vegetable, or animal life. Man is, perhaps, the greatest mystery of all to himself, for he cannot understand how he perceives, or feels, or thinks. And yet he will trust his science with its countless mysteries, while he proposes to doubt the Bible with its few.

The positive philosopher assumes to decide not only what the Creator has done, but he affirms, with absolute confidence, that he will not act further. His view might be expressed in the proposition that the Creator, after completing the universe, died. At least, he asserts, that He never will, by direct act, interfere again with His creation, and that He could not, by performing a miracle, so do, without deranging the whole system of the universe. Man, a creature so feeble that he is often obliged to lean on a crutch for support, or is compelled to swallow a drug, to relieve him from pain, and enable him to think; and who, in his best condition, is exhausted by a single day's labor; he, with the mechanism of the universe expanded before him, in all its endless action, seeing that the moon does not rest by day or night, that myriads of stars ever dance with exhaustless light, that the sun tires not in his course as he marches unchecked and unceasingly across the whole space of the heavens; he would assume to limit omnipotence, and set bounds to infinity!

So utterly, however, have all the efforts of such philosophers failed to shake the faith of the human mind in the continued superintendence of the Deity over all created things; so absolute is the confidence of men in the ever present guardianship of His hand, that if the sun were but once seen to stagger in his course, all humanity would be prostrated in terror.

There is, however, yet another remarkable analogy between the study of nature and that of the Bible. When man investigates the properties of material things, he easily acquires all the knowledge that it is most useful to him to possess, with much that is merely interesting and curious. But when he attempts to dive into the causes of things, he is powerless. In like manner when he looks to the Bible to learn his duties, they are as manifest to him as is the noonday sun in the heavens. But when he seeks to "find out the Almighty to perfection," all his powers fail him, and he hears the declaration, "Hitherto shall thou come, but no further, and here shall thy proud heart be stayed."

RELIGIOUS AND POPULAR ORATORS.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF THE SOUTH, AUGUST 5, 1875, AT SEWANEE, TENN.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

In no country in the world does public speaking perform so important a part as in the United States. It is not only true that our political contests, on the result of which depend the action of the government, are in a great degree influenced by public discussions, but almost all kinds of instruction and information are diffused in this mode. Especially is this true with regard to religious subjects. A majority, probably, of our people are dependent on oral addresses mainly for the knowledge they acquire with regard to religion.

Hence it is of the utmost consequence that the style of public speaking should approach as near perfection as possible. While we have many fine pulpit as well as popular orators, yet a majority of speakers, perhaps, fall below the standard which they ought to attain. Great pains are taken to teach men what they should say, but in what manner they ought to speak, to enable them to make the most decided impression on their hearers, is seldom thought of. In this respect, many of our public speakers are strikingly deficient.

When, however, as on this occasion, I propose to consider the defects of certain pulpit orators, and the characteristics of popular speakers, it may be objected that unless one were free from fault himself, he should not venture to criticise others. A man, however, may be able to judge whether a suit of clothes fits him, though he has never constructed a garment, and persons who cannot sing are often capable of appreciating music. The stone mason and the carpenter observe the effect of their blows on the material on which they are operating, and in like manner public speakers may be benefitted by knowing what impressions they make on their auditors. Hence, though I may be ever so faulty as a speaker, yet the points of objection made may be worthy of consideration.

Again, Burke says our antagonist is our helper. An enemy, if we have one, will be likely to find our weak points, and during my political life I was ever more anxious to read attacks made on me than commendations. As some of my criticisms will perhaps apply as frequently to ministers of the Episcopal Church as others, it may be proper that I should state that I am a member of that church, and naturally should feel a greater interest in its excellence than in that of any of the other religious denominations.

The deficiencies to which I am now about to call your attention occur more frequently in written sermons than in such as are delivered *ex tempore*. The most striking defect is the want of earnestness in manner and delivery. Many years since, at a Methodist quarterly meeting, I was struck by the force with which this point was presented by one of the preachers. While complaining of the want of earnestness among his brethren, he exclaimed: "Any one of these lawyers," pointing to several present, "will, for ten dollars, exhibit before the jury, ten times as much zeal for his client as you do in your great calling!" No one who compares the earnestness with which juries are addressed, with the delivery of many sermons, can fail to be impressed with such a remark. The animation of political speakers is not less striking. Especially is this to be noted in the cases where the candidates for office debate together, and thus struggle for each vote. If a candidate in the Southern, and many of the Western States, were to speak with no more earnestness and effect than do many clergymen, the crowd would abandon the stand in fifteen minutes, and he would be distanced in the race. I have observed, that in several instances, lawyers who became preachers, were very successful pulpit orators. The late Dr. Hawks was a shining example. This is perhaps chiefly due to the fact that they had at the bar acquired an earnest manner of speaking.

As the clergyman has the greatest of all subjects to present, and the most momentous issue to discuss, how can this defect be remedied? In *ex tempore* speaking, the difficulty is more easily overcome, for one who expresses his thoughts as they come up, naturally speaks with some animation. But in the delivery of written sermons can the evil be corrected?

We know that Demosthenes electrified the Athenians with speeches that had been written and committed to memory. Thousands of other speakers have, in like manner, been successful. Whitfield was one of the most wonderful orators that ever lived. Some of the play-actors who used to listen to him in the streets of London, with a view of improving their own elocution, said that he was never heard to the greatest advantage, except in one of those sermons that he had delivered an hundred times. When Joseph R. Chandler, then a member of Congress from Philadelphia, began to read a speech in the House of Representatives, many of the members started to get out of the hall. The practice, now so common in both Houses, of members reading their speeches, even from printed slips, was unknown, and I doubt if six speeches were read during any one Congress of my service, running through more than a dozen years. But Mr. Chandler read his

speech with so much force, earnestness and unction, that he soon commanded the attention of the House, and ever afterwards members, instead of fleeing away when he began to read, collected around him.

The play-actors, however, furnish us with the best evidence of what may be accomplished in this line. Not only do such men as Forrest and Booth, for the thousandth time, utter the same sentences with the greatest force and earnestness, but the common stock-actors deliver their parts with such animation as to interest their auditors. No man could earn a living either on the stage or at the bar, who should speak in the listless or drowsy manner which we often witness in the pulpit.

What, then, is the first step to be taken to correct this evil? The fact must be realized that men should speak to be heard. It is to no useful purpose that a man shall, in a low, inanimate tone, repeat to himself, or to a few persons, who may chance to sit near him, some things so well known that they cease to interest him. The most important sentence of every sermon is unquestionably the text on which it is founded. And yet how often is it delivered in a tone so low that the major part of the congregation do not hear it. It is true that after the speaker has proceeded for some minutes, his voice from the effect of exercise rises, probably without his being conscious of it, so that most of the congregation can hear him. Every speaker in the pulpit ought to announce his text, so that it may be heard by the whole congregation. To insure this, he should fix his eyes for the moment, at least, on those who sit most distant from him. When we speak to any one, we instinctively give to the voice that pitch which is necessary to reach the person addressed. If we do not recognize this fact, we shall either strain the voice unnecessarily by over-exertion, or fail to be properly heard.

One of our North Carolina Judges left the bench, and became a candidate for office before the people. He had been accustomed to charge juries, who sat near him, in a low tone. In his public speeches he would often turn his attention to persons quite close to him, and thus, though he spoke with sufficient animation, his voice failed to reach the greater part of his audience. On my suggesting to him that he ought rather to look to the rear of the assembly, he readily corrected the defect. To fix one's attention on the most distant auditors, requires an unnecessary strain of the voice, and it is sufficient to speak to those who are two-thirds of the distance to the outer limits. It is well, too, that the eye of the speaker should occasionally go to every part of the audience, as this influences the pitch of the voice, and every auditor perceives, both from the tone and eye of the speaker, that he is directly addressed. By thus throwing the voice into the different parts of the assembly, it is easy to see the effect produced on individuals, and this reacts on the speaker, and stimulates him to an extent that greatly increases the effect of the address.

Some speakers are so irregular in their enunciation, that a part of their sentences only, is heard. Nothing is more unsatisfactory to the hearer, than to lose sometimes the most important words of the sentences. It is easy to give due modulation to the tones of the voice, without rendering it indistinct. All the great orators I have heard,

were able to vary their tones without ceasing to be audible at any time. When one speaks naturally to the persons before him, this will usually be done unconsciously.

Clergymen, as a class, suffer from disease of the throat. This has been attributed to their much speaking. But lawyers on the circuits where I have practiced, frequently do more speaking per week than most clergymen do. They usually too, speak with much more vehemence and loudness of tone, and yet they do not suffer from that cause. The difference is, I think, due to the monotony with which the clergy speak. They strain their voices by using them in a dull, uniform tone. This consideration was brought to my mind by a fact which I will mention. For more than twenty years, I had been accustomed to *ex tempore* speaking, often in the open air, some times for three hours without cessation, and with sufficient loudness to be heard fifty or sixty yards around. This was done without any sense of fatigue to the voice. Having been invited to deliver an address, before an agricultural association, I thought it would be necessary to write it, as is usually done. When, after it was written, I attempted to read it aloud, before I got half way through, my throat, to my great surprise, began to feel pain. When the time came, however, for delivery, abandoning the attempt to follow the language as written, I spoke it to the assembly without fatigue. If one will read with animation, entering into the spirit of what he is uttering, he will easily modulate his voice naturally, and thus rest it, as the muscles of the body are relieved by changing their action, when they have been strained by continued exertion of one kind.

Many speakers, too, injure their voices, and soon break down by speaking in the throat, instead of the palate or roof of the mouth. Stephen A. Douglas, when I first knew him in Congress, used, in his vehement style of speaking, to tear his throat very much, often becoming quite hoarse. He afterwards improved his method, and spoke in a clear, ringing voice, with great ease. This evil practice can easily be cured if persons will speak only as they exhale. By throwing the voice against the roof of the mouth, and closing the teeth sufficiently, it is easy to produce both loudness and distinctness. John Bell, of Tennessee, though an able and vehement speaker at times, was very faulty in this respect. When in July, 1850, he was speaking in the Senate, and panting with excitement and the heat of the season, a word uttered as he inhaled was scarcely audible, while the next, given during a violent exhalation, went with a force almost sufficient in seeming, to cleave the roof of the edifice. Of eminent men, Mr. Wm. H. Seward probably had the worst delivery of any one I ever heard. In the ordinary parts of his speeches he talked moderately well, but when he assumed to be eloquent, he adopted a sort of sing-song, monotonous, hollow tone, like a low howl, decaying and dying away at the end of the sentences, as unnatural as possible. This faulty style I have more frequently observed in certain Presbyterian preachers than perhaps in any other class of speakers.

Any one may easily, by a few week's practice, learn to speak entirely as he exhales, and then by separating his words, so as not to let them

run into each other, and properly marking the distinctive sounds of each word, his meaning will be apprehended as far as his voice can be heard. Nor will this at all affect the rapidity of speech. On the contrary, Mr. Curran, who formerly managed the reporting of the debates for the House of Representatives, told me that a gentleman who spoke in this mode so as to be heard distinctly throughout the hall, could fill more columns of the *Globe* in an hour's speech than any member then in the House.

By giving attention to these points, by endeavoring to enter into the meaning and spirit of that which he is uttering, and by fixing his attention on his auditors, and attempting to make an impression on them, every one may not only cause himself to be well heard, but will also be able to interest his audience.

Let us now consider the peculiarities and characteristics of some of the most distinguished orators of the country. I will, in the first place, call your attention to two prominent Senators of the same State, Daniel Webster and Rufus Choate, of Massachusetts. Among orators deservedly eminent, I can recall no more striking contrast than they presented. When I first heard Mr. Webster, his voice, though not in any sense melodious, was strong, fine and very masculine. At times it reminded me somewhat, and pleasantly, of the ringing tone of a raven's note at a great distance through the air. During his latter years it lost much of its strength and volume, but was always distinct and pleasant. In 1848 he made an elaborate speech on the subject of the proposed acquisition of territory from Mexico. He differed with his colleague, Mr. Davis, had much feeling on the subject, and only spoke after thorough preparation. That speech may be remembered as the one in which he said, "Politicians are not sunflowers, they do not turn on their god when he sets, the same look that they turned when he rose." A lady at Washington mentioned to me, that fully two weeks before this speech was delivered, he sent to her a note requesting the loan of a copy of Moore's *Melodies*, and that she would mark the passage where these verses appeared. This circumstance indicates the care with which the speech was prepared. On this occasion he spoke with unusual earnestness, and was very impressive. There were several of the new members of the House in, listening to Mr. Webster for the first time. Towards the close of his speech a member from one of the Northwestern States said to me, "What is the matter with the old fellow; what makes him so dull?" "Why," I observed, "he is to-day speaking with more animation than I ever heard him." "My God!" he exclaimed, "if he were to speak to one of our Western crowds in that manner, and they did not know who he was, they would go off and leave him."

It was then the custom for certain Western speakers in the House to declaim with great vehemence of manner, clenching their fists and marching forward and backward with a formidable aspect, and when they reached the most eloquent part of the speech, the cravat was pulled off with a sudden jerk, the vest unbuttoned and thrown open, partly to diminish heat and perspiration, and doubtless also to impress the audience with the greatness of the effort being made. To persons

accustomed to such eloquence, it seemed very strange that Mr. Webster should sometimes speak for several minutes without making a gesture. In spite, however, of his usual want of action, he kept the attention of his auditors, and his speeches had that most remarkable quality, that when one looked back to them, from week to week, they seemed to stand out more prominently, and loomed in the distance.

Mr. Choate presented a most remarkable contrast to Mr. Webster. When I first entered Congress, I was told this story: Mr. Choate, as a member of the House, arose to make his first speech. Ben Hardin, of Kentucky, got up from his seat, saying that he had heard enough of the declamation of maiden orators, and that he would go out of the way until Choate had finished. As he opened the door to pass out of the hall, the singular intonation of the speaker arrested his attention, and he paused to listen to one sentence. But he held the door open till a second sentence was finished, and continued standing thus for some minutes, and then returned to his seat and heard the speech through. So peculiar were Mr. Choate's intonations, and so nervously animated were his looks and gestures that he could, even in a law argument, rivet the attention of every person present.

Early in 1844, in the Senate, he spoke on the Oregon question. Several Democratic Senators, following in the debate, assailed his speech with remarkable vehemence. It was evident that they intended to make party capital by attacking Great Britain. Conspicuous among them were Messrs. Benton, Silas Wright and Buchanan. Though, however, denouncing the pretensions, the arrogance and the insolence of Great Britain, they disclaimed any purpose to go to war with her. While these speeches were being made, one evening at a social party, on meeting Mr. Choate, I said, "Why has not your speech on the Oregon question been published?" He replied, "I have not yet made a speech on the Oregon question, but I mean to make one." Soon after he delivered probably the finest effort of his Senatorial career. After discussing, for perhaps a couple of hours, the merits of the question with an earnestness, a beauty and an eloquence seldom equaled, he turned his attention to the Senators who had assailed him. Quoting in succession the words of each one denouncing the oppressions, the insolence and the arrogance of Great Britain, "but the Senator wishes for no war with her," with consummate skill he repeated Marc Anthony's oration over Caesar's body, drawing a parallel between each Senator and one of the conspirators. "Great Britain had always been our enemy, she was arrogant, domineering, and insolent, but the Senator wishes for no war with her." "Here the well beloved Brutus stabbed, but Brutus is an honorable man." Another Senator quoted, and then the exclamation, "See what a rent the envious Casca made, but he, too, is an honorable man." So admirably had Mr. Choate prepared the minds of the auditors, that it is difficult to give an idea of the effect of these quotations. As one looked over the Senate, it seemed ready to burst into laughter; but, in fact, every one restrained his feelings, lest he might lose some of the speaker's words.

The effect on the Senators arraigned was not less striking. While Mr. Benton strove to throw it off, with an awkwardly put-on air

between indifference and defiance, Mr. Buchanan hung his head with the sheepish look of one who had been detected in a shallow stratagem. After getting through with his adversaries, Mr. Choate drew himself up to his full height, with an air of great dignity, and said, "But, Mr. President, there is one great and striking difference between Anthony and these honorable Senators, and it is due to their high character, as well as to the courtesy of the Senate, that I shall state it." As he uttered these words in a fine, manly tone of voice, and with an air of generous courtesy, the Senators raised themselves up in their seats with a countenance and manner which seemed to say, "Well, he has hit us rather hard, but he is about to make amends handsomely." Mr. Choate said, with striking emphasis, "Anthony was a villain; Anthony was a hypocrite; these honorable Senators are perfectly sincere." Had he swept the chamber with the keen cymeter of Saladin, it would seem that heads could not have sunk more suddenly.

When the speech was concluded Senator Foster, of Tennessee, and George W. Summers, of Virginia, both fine speakers and orators, with whom I happened to be standing, began to express their admiration most warmly. "If that man," said one of them, "only had the manner of Clay or Webster or Calhoun, he would universally be regarded as the greatest orator in the world." "I differ with you," I said, "it is his fine manner that in a great degree makes him so impressive, but his ideas are not in themselves as large as theirs, and are not calculated to make so great an impression." They, however, reiterated their opinions with much emphasis. Some weeks later, on speaking to them again, I found that the effect had been greatly diminished.

Why did the impression of Choate's speeches fade with the lapse of time, while Webster's thoughts retained their place in the mind, or even seemed to grow larger? When our feelings are strongly excited a mental perception will make an impression, that will be diminished as the feeling subsides. How different is the effect made on the mind by the songs of Burns or Moore when well sung, from that produced by merely reading the words. Choate's speeches were characterized by fine thoughts, great earnestness and animation, and such a combination of feelings as might be the result of the action of poetry, music, and eloquence all joined together. But after these emotions passed away, the impression faded as does that of Highland Mary or the Last Rose of Summer without the thrilling accompaniment of the song. Though Patrick Henry, by his impassioned eloquence, completely carried his audience along with its torrent, yet Mr. Jefferson said that after he had finished, one could not remember what he had said. On the other hand Mr. Webster's speeches were heard with little elation of feeling, the thoughts were great and striking in themselves, and being clearly presented to the intellect, in its calm moments, they held their place in the mind, and as other things faded from the memory, they seemed rather to swell in their proportions.

I regard Mr. Webster's greatest effort, as that delivered on the 7th of March, 1850. No mere report of it will give one an idea of its greatness, without such a knowledge of the circumstances under which it was made, as perhaps, none but those, then present, could realize.

Intense anxiety prevailed in Washington in the minds of men of all shades of opinion. The shadows of those events, which occurred a dozen years later, seemed to oppress the minds of all present. With this anxiety, there was a hope that Mr. Webster might solve the difficulty.

He spoke to such an audience as never had previously been assembled in the Senate Chamber. All felt the truthfulness of Senator Walker's words, when in moving to postpone the subject on which he had the floor, to take up that on which Mr. Webster was to speak, he said there was "But one man in America who could have drawn that audience together, and he alone could satisfy it." It was not merely that all the sitting and standing room in the Chamber was filled with a brilliant throng of ladies and gentlemen, but the distinguished character of the persons assembled was most remarkable. Being fortunate enough to get a seat on the arm of Mr. Corwin's chair, who kindly lent forward to give me room, and thus being quite near the position of Mr. Webster, I had a fair view of every countenance, turned as they were to the orator. There appeared in every look, anxiety and intense earnestness. When he arose,

"his look
Drew audience and attention still as night,
Or Summer's noontide air."

He had been speaking for nearly an hour on the subject, in general terms, before he indicated the position he meant to take. Every look retained its intense anxiety of expression, until, at the close of one of his sentences, he said in an emphatic manner, "I will not vote for the Wilmot." There seemed at once a sense of relief in the audience, accompanied by a slight rustling sound caused by the relaxation. He proceeded, and fully met the public expectation and hope. It was a purely intellectual impression made on the minds of all present, and yet the effect was greater than any mere oratory alone could have produced. I never witnessed such a sense of relief in the public mind. He had drawn from the dark cloud, the lightning which seemed ready to burst on the country. But for this effort, we should probably have had, with what result cannot now be known—the collision which occurred a dozen years later.

Of those resembling Mr. Webster in the largeness and power of their thoughts, I can recall no one so remarkable as George McDuffie. I once asked Colonel Wm. C. Preston, of South Carolina, whom he regarded as the greatest orator he had ever heard. He instantly replied, "McDuffie." Of Colonel Preston himself, it is but just that I should say, that after hearing him under favorable circumstances, I have never doubted that he was by far the greatest orator that I ever listened to. His thrilling voice, his whole action, suited to his impassioned eloquence, his bright and noble sentiments, his wonderful and imposing attitudes, placed him far in advance of any orator that I ever knew. When for the first time in Rome my eyes fell on that colossal statue of Pompey, the base of which was bathed with the blood of the great Dictator as he expired under the thrusts of Senatorial daggers, I was instantly

reminded of some of Preston's attitudes. As often as I afterwards looked on it, the same impression would strangely come over me. After the torrent of Preston's impassioned eloquence was fairly under way, he had a complete control over his auditors. When, for example, warmed with the vehemence of his action as graceful as it was impetuous, he would sometimes, as it were, unconsciously take off his wig with his left hand, and place it beside him, so as to expose his head entirely bald, there was to be seen in the audience no more tendency to smile, than when Chatham, for the third time, pronounced the word "sugar!"

McDuffie, with the largeness of thought which characterized Webster's speeches, possessed the earnestness of Choate, and a vehemence and force immeasurably superior. The array of his arguments was most powerful, and his denunciation of wrong absolutely terrific. He had not the poetry of Choate, and lacked the polish of Webster, but his massive thoughts, thrown out with tremendous energy, seemed to fall among his auditors like thunder bolts. His whole manner was that of a man calling into action every faculty he possessed, not to save his own life, for a brave man could not plead earnestly for himself alone, but as one who was making a dying struggle for the life of his country, or for truth itself. It would be interesting for one to compare Mr. Webster's speech delivered in the House of Representatives in 1824 against the tariff, with one of McDuffie's on the same subject, made in 1832.

McDuffie's speech against the removal of the deposits, delivered in 1834, bears marks of a higher degree of finish and greater polish in its language, than most of his efforts show. It is, however, less forcible and vehement than some others.

His great idol, Mr. Calhoun, was wholly unlike him in manner as a public speaker. He had as much earnestness, and at times nearly as much vehemence, but they seemed to be the result of pure mental and nerve force. Like Mr. Webster, he would sometimes stand erect for many minutes without a gesture, but when it did come, unlike the slow and often languid movement of Mr. Webster, it seemed rather the result of an electric thrill through his frame. Instead of Mr. Webster's calm, deliberate, and seemingly studied words, Mr. Calhoun's thoughts appeared to flow so rapidly that he had not time for gesticulation. His great propositions followed each other so logically, and so swiftly, that his mind seemed to be carried forward with the directness and speed of a cannon ball in its flight. As great a metaphysician as Aristotle himself, his propositions were stated with a clearness, a logical sequence and a grandeur perhaps scarcely ever equaled.

Towards the close of his life he spoke more calmly, but always with great impressiveness. As he usually addressed not the presiding officer, but his fellow-senators, there was a frankness, a dignity and a nobleness in his bearing, that carried one's mind back to the scenes when Tully or Julius Caesar stood before a Roman Senate.

Entirely different from any of these speakers was Henry Clay. When in the meridian of his power, his voice was perhaps unequalled. Both in the richness and melody of its fine tenor, and in the grandeur of its deep bass, it seemed capable of indefinite modulation and expan-

sion. Perhaps the nearest approach to it in excellence and compass, that I can call to mind, was that of Gentry, of Tennessee. But even his voice, remarkably musical, rich and varied in its tones, was scarcely equal to Mr. Clay's in compass; was not so emphatic; could not strike with as much force; nor was it capable of so great expansion in its deep organ tones. Though Mr. Clay was tall, and usually stood very erect, he never seemed stiff, as often Mr. Calhoun appeared. His gesture was abundant, easy, appropriate, very impressive, and yet always graceful as well as dignified. He never strove as some speakers do, to make an impression by the exhibition of bodily force. He was always animated, often impassioned. Whether he seemed to be addressing himself wholly and earnestly to the presiding officer, or threw the glances of his bright blue eyes over the audience, by his animated, varied, and earnest tones, and by his graceful and sometimes commanding gesticulation, he held the undivided attention of his hearers. He appeared like a champion in battle, delivering his blows right and left, and enlisted the feelings of his auditors on his side so completely, that they seemed to regard it as their own fight, and were ready to shout over each success won.

Mr. Clay was perhaps least felicitous when he attempted to utter merely handsome things, and make poetical quotations. He did not use well such prettinesses as Sargent S. Prentiss would cull from poets and novelists, and with them entertain an audience, without ever producing a deep impression on it. Mr. Clay appeared to the greatest advantage when repelling personal attacks, or when discussing topics directly connected with the honor, the safety, or the liberties of the country. His high sense of personal honor, his dauntless courage, and at times haughty daring, with his great public spirit and ardent patriotism, rendered him often imposingly grand.

It was not the possession of these powers alone, remarkable as they were, that made him the greatest parliamentary man in the world. He was a good fighter, and could take care of himself in every kind of debate. That he was at times as great an actor as Lord Chatham himself, will be evident to one who merely reads his eloquent and patriotic appeal to Mr. Van Buren in 1834, to use his influence with President Jackson, to induce him to restore the deposits, or, at a later period, his description of the interview between the Democratic Senators and John Tyler. Those men, whom he could not drive by force, he often won by his unrivaled tact and address. He, however, lost nothing in the estimation of the country by the occasional exercise of these powers, for his perfect frankness, high courage, and his public spirit, relieved him from all censure. Such means, when used at times to secure great and honorable objects, were viewed merely as we do the efforts of a skilful horseman, who to manage a fiery steed, is equally ready to use the spur, or to coax the animal. He probably concealed as few of his thoughts as any one I ever knew, and no man ever lived who was more prompt to repel all that was not alike honest, honorable and manly.

So great was his ascendancy over his admirers, and so boundless his popularity, that they were not in the least impaired by his want

of success. After his third, and what proved to be his last defeat, as a presidential candidate before the people in 1844, and after having been for some years in retirement, he came to Washington in the early part of the year 1848, to deliver an address before the Colonization Society. The hall of the House of Representatives was granted for the occasion, and the time fixed for eight o'clock in the evening. Wishing to secure a favorable position for hearing, I went up more than an hour before the time when he was to begin. On entering the capitol grounds, I was surprised to see gentlemen and ladies in large numbers standing in groups, or strolling through the grounds. I entered the rotunda, but found it packed with persons, the passages were so crowded that I could not reach the hall, and learned that it had been filled early in the afternoon by those anxious to secure seats. It was on that occasion that Mr. Crittenden, who after years of devotion to Mr. Clay, had decided to support General Taylor, said with some apparent vexation, that Mr. Clay could bring together larger crowds than any man in America, and then get the fewest votes out of them.

If Mr. Clay went to a social party, which he rarely did, the dancing was broken up by the pressure of young ladies to shake hands with him. Sometimes his presence in a church disturbed the exercises, by directing the attention of the congregation to him, instead of the preacher. While he thus, perhaps, had more personal friends than any man who ever lived, Mr. Calhoun drew to himself a smaller number, and held them with hooks of steel. Mr. Webster, notwithstanding his fine conversational powers, and great social qualities, did not fasten to himself so large a number of personal friends.

It was singular that the ascendancy of these three men should have been maintained so long in the public mind. Many possessing great ability and eloquence came up around them. John M. Clayton, Silas Wright, Corwin, Crittenden, Benton and many others there were, who would have been pre-eminently great since that time, but no one, in their day, rated them with either of the triumvers.

They were, too, all remarkable for their presence and bearing. They had, however, one cotemporary, not less eminent, who was in nowise the inferior of any one of them in form and carriage.

In the early part of the year 1835, John Quincy Adams, by the appointment of the two Houses of Congress, delivered in the hall of the House an oration on the character and services of LaFayette. That occasion was well calculated to make a deep impression on the memory of youth, fresh from his studies. The area immediately around the Speaker's desk was reserved for those not members of the House. These great Senators, with such associates as Preston, Mangum, Watkins Leigh, Poindexter and others known to fame, and Vice-President Van Buren, at their head, took the places assigned to them. The Justices of the Supreme Court, led by their dignified, most peculiar, antique-looking Chief, John Marshall, came in. They were followed by President Jackson and his Cabinet. As he appeared at a distance equal to half the breadth of the hall, there was no figure in all that vast assemblage so striking. Always imposing in manner and appearance, then in an admirably fitting suit of black, his tall

form, the wonderful perfection of his outline, his dignified carriage, his entire bearing in movement and mien, rendered him the most interesting and remarkable looking personage of all then present. I can scarcely suppose that Washington, himself, could have been seen to more advantage. During the three hours occupied by the address, delivered with surprising force and high rhetorical power, with many bursts of great eloquence, he was kept in closer proximity to Messrs. Clay and Calhoun than he had been for many years.

There was another scene occurring much later, very different from this, but not less impressive, in which two of these personages filled a most conspicuous place. In the winter of 1850 and 1851 Jenny Lind announced a concert in Washington. Being desirous of hearing her under favorable circumstances, I secured a seat near the front of the stage. The front seat was, however, reserved for certain distinguished persons whose presence was expected. Owing to the fact that several of them had been invited to a dinner party by one of the foreign ministers residing in Georgetown, their attendance was delayed, so that the room was entirely filled by a distinguished and highly cultivated audience.

The quiet was at length disturbed by a rustling and stamping of feet, and on turning towards the rear I saw that Mr. Crittenden, then Attorney General, had entered the main aisle. The applause indicated that some looked to him as the coming man for the Presidency. Blushing a little, and showing some embarrassment in manner at being thus made conspicuous, he advanced to a seat in front. After a pause of a few moments, a much more decided movement occurred, and on looking to the rear I saw the portly figure of President Fillmore advancing along the aisle. His fine form, dressed in good taste, and the easy manner in which he acknowledged the greeting extended to him, increased the applause, which seemed to say that he was not to be superseded by a member of his own Cabinet. Not many moments after he had been seated, a thundering demonstration began, surpassing emphatically either of the preceding ones. Mr. Webster had entered, just from the dinner, in regal garb, with kingly look, but that nature does not now bestow such looks on kings. His recent great efforts for his country had brought much censure on him at home, and the audience feeling this, seemed resolved to make fitting amends. He evidently felt great gratification at such a welcome, and moving forward with Mrs. Webster, a person as a lady not less distinguished in appearance than himself, took his position, not among the auditors, but upon the right of the platform, and surveyed the hall with a grand and lordly look that impressed every beholder.

There was a brief silence, and then began a still more noisy manifestation in the rear. The thumping was louder, and there were subdued shouts and cheers, and as I turned I saw the colossal figure of Winfield Scott. A powerful combination had been formed to run him for the Presidency, and his partisans then present seemed resolved that he should not be overshadowed by demonstrations for others. The noisiest stamps and the loudest cheers came from patriots, anxious to serve their country under so gallant a leader. "Six feet six in his

stockings," in showy plumage, with great elation of countenance, and a jaunty step, as he moved down the aisle, the heights of Queens-town, Lundy's Lane, Cerro Gordo and Chepultepec seemed to wave around him.

Soon after this, Jenny Lind came forward and sung a song, the music of which was almost lost in the surprise at the wonderful power and compass of her voice. She retired, and for a few moments there was a perfect silence. Suddenly a tremendous jarring began. It seemed, for a moment, as if the columns in the rear and the galleries might be tumbling down together. The tall form of Mr. Clay, in beautiful dress, was there. With bright looks, and graceful bows, and waves of his hands he, with imperial air, acknowledged the welcome. The applause was extended over the entire hall, was deep, heartfelt and universal. It seemed as if the audience, ashamed of its demonstrations to lesser favorites, would make amends by turning with renewed loyalty to its great idol.

The feeling was inspired by no idea of reward, no hope of future triumph. It was rather akin to those emotions with which we regard the memory of Sir William Wallace, or of Kosciusko. They knew that he was dying; that his political sun was sinking below the horizon; that for him, there would be no returning day; that never more would he meet the eager grasp of ardent partisans, sanguine of coming triumph; that never again, in his name, would the banners wave over shouting multitudes. A great image was passing, had in fact already passed from the American mind, leaving a sadness "deeper than the wail above the dead." No one then present perceived this more clearly, or perhaps felt it so deeply as did Mr. Clay himself.

An incident which occurred a few weeks later, brought vividly to my mind this truth. The session closed on the fourth of March, and owing to the pressure of Congressional business, I had not seen Mr. Clay for many days. Such was his health that it seemed doubtful if he would again return to Washington. The Senate was detained by some executive business, and was for awhile sitting with open doors, during the consideration of a contested election case. Not being willing to leave without seeing Mr. Clay, I walked in, and after the usual salutation said to him, "I called last evening to see you, but you were out." "I am very sorry," he replied, mentioning where he had been, "Come this evening—but no," said he, seeming to recollect suddenly, "I am to dine with Sir Henry Bulwer, but you must come and see me to-morrow evening." "No," I replied, "I leave in the morning. I only called to bid you farewell. I shall be a candidate for re-election, but you know that politics are uncertain things, and we may not meet again. I wish you to know that though I have of late opposed some of your measures, the greater part of my life has been devoted to the effort to make you President." A wonderful change instantly came over his countenance. It seemed as if that remark called up to his mind, the images of thousands of friends, who had labored so long, so ardently and so vainly for his promotion. The tears fell on his flushed cheeks, he covered his eyes with his hands for a moment,

suddenly recovered himself, and taking me by both hands, said in a subdued voice, "I know it, my dear fellow, and am very grateful for it."

His disappointment was equally shared by Webster and Calhoun. They all, however, had the good fortune to die while their great intellects were still in their meridian splendor, "before decay's effacing fingers" had robbed them of a single element of strength or grandeur. Mr. Calhoun's last speech ranks among his greatest efforts. When it was impressively read by Mr. Mason, in a fine masculine voice, as Mr. Calhoun sat by his side, thin, and pale as marble, the gesture of his brow, the active and incessant compression of his lips, his rapid glances from Senator to Senator, with an eye as bright as that of the wounded eagle, told unmistakably that there was no cloud on his intellect, and that his high heart was still unbroken.

More than an hour passed alone with Mr. Clay, shortly before his death, as he lay on a sofa, because too feeble to sit up, and with a cough so distressing that it was almost impossible for him to utter a complete sentence, showed that while his mind was oppressed by the forebodings of great evils to the country, his intellect was undimmed and the deep current of his patriotism rolled on with undiminished volume.

The Baltimore Convention of that summer had taken away Mr. Webster's last chance for the Presidency. Towards the close of August, being with him on the last day that he ever passed in Washington, though a shade of sadness rested on him, his intellect never appeared more grand, nor did his great heart ever seem to be filled with more generous and noble emotions. They have all passed on, and joined the throng of the mighty dead, whose actions have made the great current of humanity in the past, and the recollections of which in the future are to incite their countrymen to the performance of deeds of courage and glory.

As the memories of honored ancestors sustain us against temptation, and in the hour of peril, so do the accumulated glories of past ages, constitute the moral force of nations. The belief in the Athenian mind, that on the day of Marathon the shade of Theseus had marched in the van of their countrymen, and by the strokes of his flashing sword reddened the waves of the Ægean Sea with the blood of their enemies, sustained their banners at Salamis and Platea. A great oath sworn by the manes of their heroic ancestors, who had fallen in these battles, seemed to Demosthenes the strongest appeal to revive the slumbering patriotism of his degenerate countrymen.

The action of the first Brutus overthrew many a tyrant after Tarquin before it culminated on that day, when, in the Roman Senate hall, it "made the dagger's edge surpass the conqueror's sword in bearing fame away." The announcement that the victories of Cæsar were embarked on his frail boat, steadied the trembling hands of the timid pilot amid the waves of a stormy sea. At the foot of the pyramids in Egypt, to inspire his followers, Napoleon reminded them that the deeds of forty centuries looked down on them from the top of those monuments. The fact that the old guard had never recoiled in battle,

had never failed to carry victory in its charge, caused the exclamation at Waterloo, "The guard dies, but does not surrender!"

Great as is the superiority of a veteran army over one composed of only recruits, its condition, if once demoralized, is even more hopeless than that of raw levies. So is it with nations. It is almost impossible that a people once great, who have become degenerate and corrupt, can ever again take a high position. If then, nations, by some fixed law of nature, like individuals, have their rise, their progress and their decadence, how can the United States attain the greatest vigor, the highest excellence, and the most prolonged existence, as a people? Shall we rely on our more general education, and greater diffusion of literary intelligence? The Greeks, who so easily fell a prey to the Roman armies, were much more highly cultivated than were their ancestors, who resisted the Persian invasions. It was in the Augustan age, when art and literature were at their height, and the empire almost boundless in its extent, that the loss of some legions in Germany caused the Emperor to tremble on the throne of the world. His subjects were craven-hearted, because the deeds of Camillus, of Scipio, and of Marius, instead of being great present realities, were but shadowy traditions, seen dimly through the mists of luxury and effeminacy. It was a ruder, a sterner Rome, whose citizens revered the images of their ancestors, who had known no divorce for five hundred years; whose word lacked neither bond nor surety; who believed that at the lake Regillus, Castor and Pollux on white steeds had ridden, lance in hand, with the ranks of their heroic countrymen. This was the Rome that "arrayed her warriors but to conquer."

The sensual teachings of the voluptuous epicurean schools, and the derisive skepticism of Lucian, had marched in advance of the barbarian armies, and by destroying both public and private virtue and religious faith, as sin opened the gates of the infernal regions, had made a broad and easy road for political and national death.

Already does our young and vigorous republic show such premonitory signs of demoralization as justly to alarm us for the future. We hear, without general condemnation, the startling proposition that dishonest men are to be made upright by giving them abundance of money; that avarice can easily be gorged and satisfied, and that the man who is hired to be honest to-day, will be firm against temptation to-morrow. Instead of wolves being killed or driven away, they are to be rendered harmless by letting them work their will on the sheep.

We find, too, a general disposition in the public mind to excuse wrong doers, and extend sympathy to criminals rather than to their victims. As an excuse for relaxing the laws, it is asserted that juries will not convict if punishment is made severe. But if juries fail to do their duty, it is because they have been misled by a mistaken press, and a vicious public opinion, that inculcate the doctrine that it is barbarous to punish men for crimes. The tolerance is even more striking with respect to those acts that are not accompanied with violence. Such crimes, however, being usually deliberate, indicate a

higher degree of moral guilt, and are more corrupting in their tendencies. Open murders and highway robberies are less seductive as examples to young minds, than are successful and lucrative frauds.

When the public and private morals of a nation are in the best condition, indignation is felt towards criminals, and punishment is made adequate. The old English Judge was, perhaps, not far out of the way when he denied the claim of the French to be greater than his own countrymen, and asserted that England was unquestionably superior, because more men were hanged in England in one month than in a whole year in France. Lord Chatham while commending the steel-clad barons of the olden times, declared that he would not give three words of their barbarous Latin for all the classics of the silken barons of his day.

There is with us at present, not only a relaxation of morals, but the very tendency of public discussions as often conducted, seems calculated to lower the tone of the community. Demagogues attempt to palm off on the ignorant portion of their audiences, buffoonery for wit, and by coarse images win the applause of those whom Shakespeare has denominated "barren spectators." They forget that the effect of such counterfeit eloquence is easily removed by the next clown who may chance to come along. Even when public positions are thus won, the officer frequently derives as little credit from his success as the public does advantage. Though *Æsop's* ape, by his antics, carried the day against the fox, and became king of the beasts, yet his reign was neither felicitous to himself nor honorable to his subjects. It is little less discreditable to an officer to disgust the public by his incompetence, than it is for him to be ejected for official corruption.

When, too, the compensation of members of Congress was only one-fifth of what it has since been made, there were no charges of bribery against them. As all the great men I have named served at the low rate of compensation, it is idle to pretend that competent men can only be obtained by large salaries. By offering money as the inducement, you catch the avaricious and the greedy. How, then, are we to resist the downward tendency? A mere profession of Christianity will not avail, for the modern Italians do not present us with such examples of heroic fortitude as did the early martyrs. Education undoubtedly shapes the human mind, but all educations are not alike. It required as severe training to render the Spartan content with his black broth, or to induce the Mohawk Indian to travel for weeks on parched corn, as it does in our day to make the finished opera dancer, or the voluptuous fop who imagines himself the perfection of humanity.

When the youth of the country are trained to consider wealth, luxury and refinement as the chief objects of man's existence, are we to be astonished that they do not present us with examples of heroic self-denial and noble patriotism? "Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles?" When tares are industriously sown, can the husbandman expect an abundant crop of wheat?

While considering the subject of popular oratory, it is well to remind the young men of the country that those minds that are capable of

retaining impressions permanently, are not to be carried away by mere buffoonery, and recitals from the jest book. The men who are to control the destinies of the country are chiefly to be influenced by appeals to their intelligence and higher moral feelings. Religious movements are impelled by such earnest advocates as Peter the Hermit, Luther, Knox and Wesley; Senates are controlled by the grand eloquence of a Demosthenes, and the lofty appeals of a Chatham. Revolutions are inaugurated and driven forward by the fiery enthusiasm of a Henry or a Mirabeau. Those in our day who seek to advance the welfare of the country and to acquire honor for themselves must select these high models for their imitation. With a purpose to aid such aspirations, I have presented for your consideration the great triumvirate, who sought not power by shedding the blood of their countrymen, but only to occupy the domain of intellect, of eloquence, and of patriotism.

ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT DAVIDSON COLLEGE, NORTH CAROLINA,
JUNE 25, 1873.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

GENTLEMEN OF THE PHILANTHROPIC AND EUMENIAN SOCIETIES:

When attempting a compliance with the invitation given me, I am not insensible to the difficulties of the undertaking. Many such views and suggestions as are, at the same time, truthful and appropriate to an occasion like this, have doubtless been presented by previous speakers. By going out into the boundless fields of error and fallacy, one might easily find novelty. Perhaps the utmost that could be hoped for, would be to present just considerations in such a manner as to render them interesting and impressive. Even if, therefore, I should unintentionally repeat something that had already been said by another, your time might not be entirely misspent. The agriculturist finds that it is not sufficient for him to have gone once only over his ground, but that constant effort is necessary to keep in subjection the rebellious forces of nature. So in the intellectual and moral world, to combat adverse influences, true views must be presented and urged from time to time. Unless this be done, the most important facts and principles pass from the human mind.

The effect of sound teaching is, in part, to anticipate experience. If wisdom herself were to speak to-day, you would not, perhaps, be willing to adopt her views. But as a student, who has carefully read the proper books, will by practice rapidly acquire knowledge necessary to make him a first-rate-lawyer, so if sound theories are clearly and for-

cibly presented to you, the consideration of not many facts will be sufficient to bring your minds to a just conclusion. When a law in mechanics, or chemistry, is stated, a few trials are sufficient to establish its truth, and you are relieved from the necessity of groping in the dark through a multitude of experiments.

In some of the past ages, the mind of man seems to have been regarded as an empty vessel, into which one thing might be put as easily as another. In the monkish period, even if natural propensities and faculties were recognized, it was supposed that they might be eradicated or entirely suppressed. We should, in fact, destroy a young vine by striving to press it back into the earth, but its course and form may be easily modified and directed. Instead of the paradox of Bacon, that "you can only govern nature by obeying her laws," I would say, that we only derive advantage from the natural laws when we act in accordance with them.

Our present systems of education are still faulty in this respect: that they do not sufficiently recognize the diversities of the human constitution and intellect. The most stupid wagoner knows that if he bestows as many blows with his whip on the spirited horse as he does on the sluggish one, the finer animal will be destroyed. In like manner, if the boy of quick intellect and nervous excitability is stimulated, instead of being restrained, from the over exercise of his mental faculties, he is liable to be broken down early in life. Many a youth of genius is thus utterly ruined for the want of as much knowledge of his bodily and mental organization as a month's proper study would give him. The same amount of labor which invigorated the robust constitution of Benjamin Franklin, would have destroyed Lord Bacon early in life. Many a young man, after he has sustained irreparable injury, learns, but too late, that which, if earlier known, would have saved him from ruin.

But young gentlemen, you who now stand, as it were, on the threshold of active life, and, like the trained courser, are eagerly waiting the tap of the drum that you may start away on the career which lies before you, I know your thoughts and feelings. You desire to attain the greatest good, to secure to yourself the largest share of human happiness. Diverse as may be the objects you seek, they are chosen upon the supposition that they are capable of furnishing what you desire. You perhaps believe that there is some one thing, which, if attained, will make you happy. The sooner you dismiss such an illusion, the less your disappointment.

Those who, after acquiring great wealth by their own efforts, have sought merely to enjoy it, avow their complete disappointment, and are usually obliged to re-embark in business. Several wealthy young men, whom I knew in college, afterwards assured me that they would gladly give away all their property, if by so doing they could acquire the capacity for cheerful labor that some others possessed. If man's faculties were as limited as are those of the swine, wealth alone would give him all the happiness of which his nature was capable; but be assured that there is no one thing which can of itself render man happy. The only enjoyment we are capable of is that resulting from

the exercise of some of our faculties. Recall, if you please, every sensation of pleasure you have ever experienced, and you will find it was the result of the exercise of some bodily or mental power. Sometimes it is delightful to use the muscles in walking, dancing, or the canter of a spirited horse. Music, intellectual perceptions, theatrical representations and novel reading, by calling into action, successively, various faculties, furnish us a large number of our most agreeable emotions. The gratification of our animal passions and tastes, and the exercise of the domestic affections, give us many of our greatest enjoyments. There can be no pleasure to humanity except from such sources.

But again, every one of these faculties may be so fatigued by continued exertion, that painful sensations will result. If over-work has been long continued, and the pain has become great, then rest alone gives high pleasure. Every one knows how delightful it is after a fatiguing walk, merely to lie down. But the most important law of all in this connection, is usually lost sight of. There can be no high degree of happiness without previous want. If a man were to resolve that he would live merely for the pleasure of eating, what ought he to do? If he remained at home and ate the finest viands as often as his appetite could bear them, he would find little enjoyment. Clearly it would be of advantage to him to fast for a season. When one has for a time been deprived of food, he will experience more real pleasure from a single meal than he would from a month's regular feeding. The traveler, the hunter, the fisherman, all by their experience, will confirm this truth. How delightful it is, when one has been long suffering from thirst, to take a draught of pure water! You will readily admit that it is true that our animal appetites are easily gorged, but a similar law operates with respect to all our faculties. The finest concert, if indefinitely continued, would become painful. To enjoy greatly the comforts of home, one must have been absent for a time. The sublimity of Milton, and the wit of Hudibras, fatigue us by long continuance.

The law seems to be that we can only derive enjoyment by the alternate exercise and rest of the several faculties. If you desire a high degree of pleasure, you must abstain for a long period. Should you, on the contrary, be satisfied with a low stage of happiness, a sort of vegetable existence, then you may continually call on your faculties. The bow, perpetually bent, expands with little force, and every one may, therefore, decide for himself whether he will take a high enjoyment, with great exertion, or be content with a low state of pleasure, obtained by a languid existence.

But again, all the human faculties must be exercised to insure a healthy condition of the system. If any one piece in the complicated machinery of a steam engine should give way, mischief results, because there is no part of the engine that is not necessary to its successful working. In like manner, there are no useless organs in the human body, or faculties in the mind; and hence, if any one of them were destroyed, injury would result to the constitution as a whole. But, with striking resemblance between the two, there is, for man, an unfor-

fortunate difference. Even if parts of the steam engine remain at rest, they retain their full strength, but in the case of the man, any one of his organs or faculties, not exercised, loses its power; and hence, the whole system suffers.

It would seem, therefore, that any one who selects an occupation that his judgment approves, ought to have the same chance for happiness in life; but while most persons will admit the truth of such a proposition, there is a constant tendency in the human mind to ignore it. If a man should seek to find an exception to the law of gravity, or to invent perpetual motion, he excites ridicule, because it is clearly seen that there are no exceptions to the physical laws. But men constantly act as though they hoped to find exceptions to the moral laws. Many hug the delusion that distinguished position, high public eminence, will give more happiness than is to be found in the walks of private life. This means to the ambitious American mind that it is well to become a member of Congress, a president, or a distinguished military leader. As so few persons can be thus gratified, it is of the utmost importance that such a delusion should, if possible, be dispelled and countless disappointments be prevented.

During sixteen years, I had in Congress an opportunity of knowing much of the members, and though they were generally men of worth and industry, I am satisfied that their enjoyments were not above those of the average of their fellow-citizens. They usually left public life with the conviction that their labors had brought them neither the thanks of their countrymen nor happiness to themselves. Six of the presidents were personally known to me, and I have no hesitation in saying that of all the public functionaries I ever knew, they were during their terms of office, the least happy. No one else had so much care and vexation, was compelled to labor more incessantly, had so few thanks, or seemed so thoroughly disgusted with his position. Unless they left the office with the consolation that they had done their duty, they were the least fortunate of men. Even in that event they had no advantage over any private citizen who is able to say, I have done my duty honestly through life.

But you may say these were not great men, or they were unlucky, and you may promise yourself something better. Let us then for a moment consider the first Napoleon, unquestionably the most wonderful man of modern times, in the opinion of many, of all times. His extraordinary achievements, his long and brilliant career, are too familiar to need recital. But he led an army into Egypt, and when the clouds of disaster lowered upon him, he secretly abandoned it. He conducted five hundred thousand men in an expedition to Moscow, and leaving them to perish, he again sped back to Paris. At Leipsic, after a decisive defeat, abandoning all to McDonald and Poniatowski, he for the third time fled away. When his star went down forever at Waterloo, leaving his old guard to die for their own honor, a fourth time he carried in person to his capital the news of his defeat. In all these cases he abandoned the men whom he had led into danger. If one man were to follow you into an enterprise attended with peril, could you desert him and save yourself by flight? Is there one

person who now hears me that would be willing to bear in his bosom these dark recollections of the thousands thus abandoned, for all the glories of Marengo, the campaign of Wagram, and the sun of Austerlitz?

You may truthfully say that Napoleon was a guilty man and could not be happy. Then look to George Washington, who, by the universal judgment of the world, for the eminence of his moral worth, and the great results accomplished by him, stands as the most foremost and the most fortunate of men. Pass by the toils and disappointments of his earlier years, trace him through the entire period of the Revolution as the most anxious, the most thoughtful, and the gravest man in the American army. He, above all men who have lived, perhaps, seems most to remind one of the demeanor of the Saviour of the world, melancholy even to sadness. And during his administration of the Federal Government, he appeared to be oppressed with care and weighed down by anxieties. His whole life was like that of one to whom had been entrusted the carrying of a casket of precious jewels, on a perilous journey, which could only be preserved by sleepless vigilance. To make amends for his extraordinary toils and sufferings, he had the consolation of having done his duty, under trying circumstances.

Were these great men peculiar, or exceptional in their career? The gifted Alexander, after his conquest of the world, died in a fit of drunkenness, while Julius Caesar, probably the first of men, in genius, talent, courage, magnanimity, accomplishments and achievements, fell by the daggers of trusted friends. Nor was the puritanical Cromwell more happy than the voluptuous Grand Monarch of France. We imagine great men to be happy, because we see only their prominent features, which glare before the public eye, while their inner life is hidden from us. Their brightness is but the enchantment which distance lends. On a near approach it fades away as the blue of the mountain becomes rugged rock, its smooth and green slopes are converted into thickets of tangled shrubs and brambles, and its cloud, so white in the sunlight as to dazzle the eye, is seen to be only dark mist.

It was once my fortune to witness a remarkable spectacle, the review of the army of Italy, on its return to Paris, on the 14th of August, 1859. The entire area of the magnificent Place Vendome was converted into an immense amphitheatre, with velvet-cushioned seats, and graceful hangings of crimson and gold, and gay festoons and countless flags, and ornate columns, surmounted with gilded statues of victory. Between the great triumphal column of Napoleon the First and the balcony of the Empress, formed of cloth of crimson and gold, and alike tasteful and splendid, there was barely left space enough for the army to pass. And as the eighty thousand picked men, covered with the fresh green laurels of Magenta and Solferino, with elastic step, came along down the Rue de la Paix, their glittering bayonets, gilded by the sunbeams, reminded me of a field of ripe grain gently waving in the breeze. With rapid pace they swept by, with cheering shouts, and the music of an hundred bands, and their

varied equipments and arms, infantry, Voltiguers, Zouaves, Turcos, Guards Imperial, artillery, mailed and crested cavalry, with captured cannon and banners, dented or torn, fitting trophies of victory. Looking at their splendid array, with its imposing and gorgeous spectators, such as the modern civilization of Europe and America could alone furnish, I felt confident that that day's pageant surpassed any that had hitherto been presented to the eye of man. The Roman triumphs came up in fancy before me, and remembering that Cæsar had won the empire of the world at Pharsalia, with only twenty-two thousand men, a victory which any one of the batteries then passing would, if used against him, have converted into a defeat, I compared the display before me with that which the narrow streets and comparatively rude population of Rome would have furnished.

As the strains from one of the martial bands filled the air, my mind went back suddenly to the first Roman triumph, when Romulus, in his robe of state, and with laurel crown on his brow, singing a song of triumph, marched along on foot, and carried on his right shoulder, suspended on an oaken trophy, the arms of King Acron, whom he had slain in single combat. How much did the small band of desperate outlaws admire the *Great Romulus*, as with stalwart frame and martial tread, he strode along to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius? Was he not elated and happy in the thought that he had attained the highest reward of human ambition? Was Napoleon, the arbiter of Europe, more happy? Of all the spectators in that bright throng, he alone was deeply thoughtful and melancholy. Why was this? A man, confident of his own destiny, and at all times void of personal fear, he could not, on that day, apprehend the sharp shot, or the explosive shell of the assassin. Was he depressed by the sad thought that his career had been interrupted, and that he had failed to make Italy free from the Alps to the Adriatic? Or was he meditating on the fickleness of the breath of popular applause, and dreading the upheaval of some new revolutionary earthquake? Did he fear to fall from the giddy height he had attained, or did he simply realize the truth, that he who has climbed to the topmost round of the ladder of ambition, often seems to the public to sink because he does not continue to rise still higher? Or, did the shadows of coming events, mysteriously, and, by strange anticipation, darken his mind? I know not; but neither the gorgeous display around, nor the triumphal march, nor the spirit-stirring trump or drum, nor even the gladsome shouts of his soldiers, as they cheered their victorious commander, could change that thoughtful countenance. Only once was it lit for a moment with a smile, when his little son, in the uniform of corporal, was brought from the side of the Empress, and placed on his horse before him.

Twelve years have passed by, and that majestic column of more durable material, and grander height than those of Trajan, or Antoninus, had fallen to the earth by the hands and amid the shouts of a beastly multitude, who were far more vociferous than they had been on the day when they cheered the imperial arbiter of Europe. His

armies were all captured and vanquished, and he a prisoner in a foreign land, dying with as much pain and gloom as did his greater uncle. Pharaoh, in the Red Sea; Nebuchadnezzar among the cattle; Alexander, the Macedonian, dying in a drunken debauch; Hannibal, in exile, by poison; Julius Cæsar, stabbed by his friends; the two Napoleons, captives, sinking under gloomy defeat and painful disease; these are, by consent of all mankind, the chiefest representatives of human greatness and glory. Which of them, young gentlemen, do you envy the most, and which will you choose for your model? As in the case of the Babylonian monarch, may not all these examples have been provided, "to the intent that the living may know, that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever He will, and setteth over it the basest of men?"

If, then, it is evident that high positions do not ensure happiness, let us at once recognize the truth that all honest occupations are equally capable of giving satisfaction to those who are engaged in them. But whatever one finds to do, let him do it with all his might. This injunction is the more necessary to us in our present condition as North Carolinians. Within the past ten years, two-thirds of all the property in the State has been destroyed, and, therefore, it is difficult for us, with the remaining third, to support such a state of civilization as we have been accustomed to enjoy, and educate properly the rising generation. The tendency of young men to crowd what is called the learned professions, is most unfortunate. Our systems of education are perhaps partially responsible for this. They direct the attention of the student too much to the ideas and opinions of men, rather than to things. The best knowledge is not that obtained second-hand or through a medium. When one examines for himself a house, or an animal, or a landscape, he knows far more of it than any mere description could give him. The opinions of others should be regarded only as aids to us, and not as the ends to be sought. Small minds are merely able to take hold of the declarations of others. They may make dialecticians, mislead the superficial, and often acquire a great reputation for learning and wisdom, with the multitude; but when they are placed in positions where conduct and real ability are demanded, they usually show themselves childishly imbecile. It requires more breadth and strength of mind to enable one to deal with men and events. If the young men of the day wish to be practically useful, and to become really great, their studies must take a wide range, they must investigate material things, and by acquainting themselves with the forces of inanimate nature, as well as the impulses which move men, they will be better able to effect great and useful enterprises.

But the task before us, I know, seems difficult. When our great armies were beaten, our people with one accord, decided to abandon the contest. As the lion when his spring has failed, does not pursue, so they were too wise to prolong a petty and vexatious struggle as a semi-civilized community would have done, and too great-hearted to manifest hostile feelings or mortification under defeat. On the contrary, it was gratifying to see with what diligence and alacrity our citizens went to work to repair their losses. Not only was great mate-

rial improvement everywhere in progress, but it was astonishing to observe how suddenly our people settled down into the routine of quiet life. Probably in no period of our history, were the laws more successfully administered, and private rights better protected, and the community as a whole, more peaceful, than throughout the year 1866. The United States, however, thought proper to abolish our State government, to disfranchise most of those citizens whose capacity and training fitted them to discharge public business, and also conferred the right of suffrage and to hold office on a large class without experience or knowledge. That to effect these objects, the Reconstruction Acts were necessary, I do not question, for our own people would not of themselves have either disfranchised their leading men, nor given, universally the right to vote and hold office to the liberated colored men. It would be out of place at this time, for us to enquire whether we might not have so acted, as to have greatly lessened the mischief caused by these proceedings.

Their immediate effect has been, for the last six years, to afflict us with governments which, to use the mildest terms, have, whether we consider their legislative, executive or judicial action, proven themselves utterly incapable of properly transacting the business of the State. Our credit has been completely destroyed, and our people have been demoralized, politically and financially, though not as yet socially. As a State, we cannot at present do much, directly, to advance our material prosperity, and as individuals, we have to struggle against great odds. The influx of capital and emigrants is prevented. When abroad, I often hear such questions as these: "What are you going to do about your State debt? will you repudiate? I am not willing to live in a repudiating State. Is not your taxation oppressive? When can you have a better system of government? I would like to invest in your State, or move there, but I am afraid." The present tariff and internal revenue systems, which are onerous even to the Northern States, fall with oppressive weight on our crippled and feeble community.

These burthens, however, great as they are, may all be borne. The fact that no one who was true to the State in the late great struggle can, during the present generation, hope to become President, or attain any similar high position under the government, is not a serious evil. The less the love of office be stimulated, perhaps the better for our people in their present condition. The Jews under political bans, in every country in Europe, during the middle ages, became the wealthiest and the most enlightened people of those days. It will be time enough for us after we have restored our own material prosperity, again to aspire to control the destinies of our common country. To our young men who may think of embarking in public life, I would say, that the chief defect I found among the members of Congress in former times, was the want of moral or political courage. An hundred times has it been said to me "this measure is right and ought to pass, but my constituents do not understand it, and if I were to vote for it they would beat me." Or, perhaps, this would be stated, "this thing is all wrong, and I hope you will be able to get it defeated, but

my people are in favor of it, and if I don't go for it I will not be able to get a nomination again." Several members from North Carolina took positions on an important issue against what was regarded as the popular feeling. Some of them afterwards, to break the force of the opposition they feared, modified their positions. They were all beaten, while the two members who stood firmly by their opinions, were triumphantly returned.

Nothing gives a man so much force in discussion as the conviction that he is in the right, nor is any adversary so dangerous as one honestly in error. I would rather fight against the most ingenious sophist than such a person. If I think a man right, I embark in no contest with him, for I know that any partial advantage gained would be only like the fruit of the Dead Sea. If a man will take invariably that course on public questions which he sees to be right, he will always feel proud of his position, and will be able to defend it with an earnestness and force that will generally carry his hearers along with him. The conviction of being right, ever present, is worth more to him than the erroneous opinions of a thousand.

Again, the result of the late civil war does not of itself prove that we were, as a people, less worthy than our opponents. The Philistines, who for forty years at a time made the Israelites hewers of wood and drawers of water, were not themselves less idolatrous and wicked. No man in England did so much to promote the reformation as Henry VIII, sensual, bloody and brutal tyrant as he was. The locusts that came out of the bottomless pit to punish wicked men for five months, were themselves but the subjects of Apollyon, and returned again to his dominion. "The ways of Providence are past finding out, and are wiser than the imaginations of men." It will be for us by our actions hereafter to show whether we are better or worse than our late opponents. There should be no hesitation on our part, in conceding to the Northern men the same sincerity and public spirit we claim for ourselves. It is evident from the debates in the convention which formed the Constitution of the United States, that there were certain great questions at issue, on which no agreement could be effected, and they were, therefore, by common consent, left to take the chances for settlement in the future. While constitutional guarantees, and present pecuniary and social interests were largely on our side, the general feeling of the civilized world, ignoring the distinction of races, was in favor of personal liberty, and thus against us. Hence, when the war was begun, it was but natural and proper that each citizen should stand with the community in which he lived, as when a war occurs between separate nations.

For the great war itself North Carolina was not, as a State, nor were her sons responsible. Soon after its close, in December, 1865, I met the present Vice-President of the United States in Washington, and he said to me, "I am glad the war is over; it could not have been avoided; the people of the North were determined to abolish slavery, and you, in the South, had too great an interest in it to give it up without a fight." A few weeks later, in New York, Governor Seymour, certainly intellectually equal to any statesman of the day, remarked to

me that he had, at the beginning of the war, been inclined to condemn the course of the Southern men in seceding, but that he was then convinced that the collision could not have been avoided. General Martindale, in his address to the Grand Army of the Republic, in Philadelphia, since, has stated, with great clearness and force, that the war was the result of causes for which the people of neither the North nor of the South, of this generation, were responsible; and that those who fought on both sides had borne themselves like brave and honorable men in a cause regarded as just. Such is now, apparently, the conviction of all the leading statesmen of both parties in the North. From 1850, down, I had a conviction that such a collision could not be long postponed except by a foreign war. Regarding that as the less of the two evils, I, therefore, as a member and Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, endeavored to induce both Presidents Pierce and Buchanan to go to war with Great Britain, who had furnished us ample grounds for such an act by her persistent efforts to produce a civil war in our own country. An union of the remains of the old Whig and Democratic parties, in 1860, might probably have postponed the difficulty for a few years, or caused a different termination of the contest.

Even for the preceding state of affairs, which caused the war, North Carolina was not responsible. The African slaves were imported originally into the colony under the orders of the British Government, and when the Revolution began, the first North Carolina Congress passed a resolution against the slave trade. During the formation of the Constitution of the United States, North Carolina, with the Middle States, voted against the continuance of the trade, but was overborne by the united vote of the New England States, aided only by South Carolina and Georgia. In addition to these things, the Constitution of the United States, which we only adopted after two years refusal so to do, contained the strongest guarantees for the protection of the exciting system. Had we, therefore, quietly submitted to have our constitutional rights disregarded, one-third of our whole property confiscated, and our social system destroyed, we should have been a mark for the finger of scorn, and would, ever after, for our mean cowardice, have been regarded as a reproach to humanity. A people, that voluntarily consents to be trampled under foot and thus degraded, delivers itself up to demoralization, corruption and ignominy. By our manly resistance we have not only retained our self-respect, but acquired the confidence and esteem of all the enlightened nations of the earth. I would a thousand times rather be pointed to as the individual who had lost most in the great struggle, than to have come out of it unscathed and prosperous.

It is probable that a different result, might by other counsels, have been produced. Individually, I had such an opinion, and wrote to a committee in Charlotte, in 1856, advising that we should rather strive to hold the government, and make the fight in the Union. At some period before the collision of arms began, North Carolina, by taking position and presenting an ultimatum through the action of her convention, could probably have given a different turn to the contest.

As, however, she did not think proper to attempt to control the movement after several of the States had seceded, and the war had been begun, a proper regard for her safety and honor left her no alternative. Having then done what could not have been honorably avoided, why should we not be content with our action? Providence has relieved us from the responsibility and care of the African race, and given us a new social system. Time will enable us to decide if this is not in the end advantageous to us. If the change has been attended with great privation and much suffering, let us not forget that adversity, though painful, rightly borne, gives fortitude, purifies and ennobles.

The past is secure to us. If, as it has been alleged, the government was, up to the year 1860, mainly under the control of the Southern States, we may well accept such responsibility. During this long period there were no charges of bribery against Congressmen, except that just before the commencement of the war we expelled several members from the Northern States, not because they had taken bribes, but had merely expressed a desire to obtain money in improper modes. No great government in modern times has existed, that for such a period was so pure in its administration, so economical in its expenditures, and so light and moderate in its taxation. How it has since been we will not pause to consider. I know, however, so many good and noble men in the North, that I cannot doubt but that with our earnest aid, great improvements may be made in the administration.

There is nothing in the past history of our State to prevent her taking a most prominent part in such a movement. Ten years before the Boston tea-party, disguised as Indians, in the night-time, threw the tea into the harbor, North Carolinians in open day arrested the stamp-master in Wilmington, and carrying him into the public square, compelled him to swear that he would never attempt to execute the Stamp Act. More than four years before the fight at Lexington, two thousand North Carolinians were engaged in battle on the Alamance against Tryon, the British governor. The Declaration of Independence made in this county, preceded by more than a year that proclaimed in Philadelphia, and during the entire struggle, old Mecklenburg, by the testimony of Cornwallis and Tarleton, bore the palm of being the most rebellious county in America. The defeat of Ferguson, on King's Mountain, enabled Greene to so cripple Cornwallis at Guilford Court House, as to oblige him to retreat, after a battle which Thomas H. Benton, and many others, regard as the turning point of the Revolution. While to Virginia belongs the honor of Washington's birth, this county gave Andrew Jackson to the country.

Our late great contest was mainly fought by infantry, and no other State furnished so large a force of that arm as did North Carolina. Mr. Davis himself, in no respect partial to us, told me in 1864, that our regiments were better kept up than those of any other State. Nor did any other State lose so many men in battle. So little since the war has been written in our behalf, that few, even of our own citizens, do justice to the achievements of our soldiers. Some of the most

striking events of the war have not found a notice even in a North Carolina newspaper. It was the unsupported charge of a North Carolina brigade that repulsed Foster with his twenty-two thousand men at Goldsboro. That same brigade took the most prominent part in the defense of Battery Wagner and Sullivan's Island, and gave that confidence to the commanders at Charleston that insured the successful defense of the harbor and city. The charge of two of its regiments at Drury's Bluff, completely routed General Butler's whole command, and drove it to Bermuda Hundreds, to be there "bottled up." This brigade, with the loss of one-third of its members on the evening of June the 1st, 1864, preserved the important position of Cold Harbor to General Lee, though in consequence of the giving way of the troops on its left, it was compelled at the same time to fight enemies in front, flank and rear. On the 17th of June, 1864, at Petersburg, when two brigades on its right fled precipitately, and left a mile of open space through which a portion of the enemy passed, it drove them back—unaided it repulsed, in succession, twelve charges made by the combined corps of Smith and Burnside, forty-three thousand strong, and held the position until the enemy abandoned the contest. On the 19th of August, south of Petersburg, in a successful charge, it captured three times as many prisoners as it then numbered soldiers in its ranks. Up to this time, though it, during one period of three weeks, lost considerably more than half as many men by wounds in battle, as it ever had present at one time for duty, it was never broken by any attack. These facts are known to thousands, and cannot be, therefore, ignored or forgotten. It is but a small tribute to the courage and gallant deeds of these brave men, that I should to-day refer to some of their actions. North Carolina gave to the Confederacy more than one hundred and twenty thousand men, who, man for man, rank with any that in past ages have, embattled, stood for king or cause, for liberty or native land.

Nothing in modern warfare has approached the impetuous dash of the Confederate charge. The great Athenian rush of Marathon was again and again repeated on a far grander scale, with an utter disregard of danger, and an uncalculating devotion to their cause never previously seen in battle. Complete physical exhaustion alone arrested the movement.

Though our soldiers fell in a cause that was unsuccessful, they will not for that be forgotten. Sir William Wallace was hanged, drawn and quartered, but not for this has his memory been lost to Scotland. The thirty thousand gallant men who gave their lives for the protection and the honor of their State, for their name and their race, will not fade from the memories of their countrymen of future ages. For the consolation of their friends let it be remembered that whosoever for the cause of truth "will lose his life, shall find it," and that they who "forsake houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, wife, or children, or lands, shall receive an hundred fold, and everlasting life."

If, then, we have in the past done our duty as a people, how ought we to meet the future? Not by merely railing at those with whom,

by our surrender, we admitted that we were not in a condition longer to continue the contest. Not by blustering after the fashion of a few among us, who seem vexed with themselves now, because in the hour of danger they did not earnestly aid us, and are striving to recover consideration which they seem to fear they have lost. Still farther be it from us to form secret bands, and in disguise, in the night-time, to make covert attacks on defenseless individuals of any race. From the day when such a movement, years ago, first overspread a large part of our country, I have regarded secret political organizations as the most mischievous and corrupting of all human inventions. The deluded and ignorant men who were drawn into the Ku-Klux and other secret societies, by men in whom they had confidence, are entitled to sympathy. When I have seen them, by the hundred, dragged over the State as prisoners, I have felt the strongest indignation against the originators of the movement, who so meanly shrunk from avowing their responsibility. Had he who first introduced the organization into the State, or assumed control of it, been possessed of a single emotion of honor or manliness, when he saw his deluded followers dragged about by deputy marshals, he would have left his hiding place, and, like Virgil's warrior, have exclaimed: "*Adsum qui feci; in me converte ferrum.*" By such an act he would not only have released his followers, but, to some extent, entitled himself to respect and consideration.

To continue such a secret organization to control the distribution of offices in the State, is little less dishonorable. When men, while professing to be members of a great open political party, form a secret inside combination for such a purpose, they can only be looked upon as treacherous conspirators against associates with whom they pretend to be acting on terms of fairness and equality. I advise you, gentlemen, as you wish to retain your own self-respect, and as you hope to be useful to your country, as you desire the approval of good men, and of Powers higher than all earthly things, avoid such complications. When in doubt as to your public duties, it may be well to ask yourself, "If all this should become known, what would my enemies say? what could my friends think of such a transaction?"

What we now have to do, is to build up the prosperity of the State again. I fear that many are too despondent to do their full share in this great work. A horse disheartened does not draw the vehicle, a man discouraged accomplishes little, a people demoralized seldom prospers. Our noble women have, by their conduct, told us what we ought to do. Before the war, it seemed to me that nothing could add to the respect and admiration I felt for them; but when, during the great struggle, I witnessed their resignation under privations, their sacrifices and their labors, and have since observed how, under defeat and poverty, they have not failed in every honorable and proper work for their hands, I admire and reverence them far more than I ever did in the days of our prosperity. If every one of us would, for five years, labor as earnestly as we generally did during the war, and live as economically, we should be, at the end of that period, far in advance of what we now are.

You may say it is impossible to bring our community up to this. Then, at least, let us strive to come as near it as we can. When in the midst of labor that is vexatious or oppressive, nothing comes so frequently, perhaps, into the mind as the words, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work." Those whom St. John saw continually before the throne, arrayed in white robes, were "they which came out of great tribulation; they hunger no more, neither thirst any more;" and there they will remain forever.

A thousand instances prove that a great pressure of evil, borne with fortitude, prepares us for future triumph. When their town had been burnt by the Gauls, the Romans did not abandon it, but having expelled the invaders, by their energy rebuilt it, and in time made it the first city in the world. The Jews, though wanderers for thousands of years, have retained their faith and their traditions. Even the Gipsies, rambling for a like period among many peoples and nations, have, in spite of their ignorance and poverty, preserved their identity. As we have made a fair and manly contest to maintain the political, industrial and social condition, which came down to us from our fathers, why should we indulge in vain regrets? Abandoning, as far as possible, all gloomy thoughts, let us, stimulated by past recollections of prosperity and honor, look to the future. Though the lines of this generation have not fallen in pleasant places, we may lay broad and deep the foundations of prosperity and happiness for those who are to come after us.

The same system of laws in the future must operate on us and also on the citizens of the Northern States. In the past we did not fear to compete with them on terms of equality, either in civil or military enterprises. After listening to the eloquent speech of a Southern Senator, John G. Palfrey, an Abolition member from Massachusetts, turning round, said to me, "It is by just such speeches that you have kept your foot on our necks for seventy years." When one said to Mr. Seward, "there are ten Northern men in California to one from the South; are you not willing to leave the question of slavery to the majority, when you have ten to one?" "No," he replied, "if we had five hundred to one, you would then beat us." Such declarations from those politically unfriendly, show at least that we need not dread competition in the walks of peaceful life. In war, we point to the names and deeds of Washington, Jackson, Harrison, Scott and Taylor, in the past, and later to such actions of the Southern soldiery as rise of themselves before your minds.

We have still, more than fifty thousand square miles of territory, not inferior, perhaps as a whole, to any country of equal extent. We have yet on our eastern border those broad bays and sounds, abundantly stored with such wealth as the sea contains. There are still those large bodies of alluvial lands, not inferior in fertility to the lowlands of Holland, or the Delta of Egypt. We yet have that long and broad belt of sandy loam, capable of producing wine enough for the wants of an hundred millions of people. Above this extends for nearly three hundred miles, an undulating country, that with proper tillage yields abundantly. We have also that large mountain region,

which, though it does not possess the grandeur and sublimity that renders the Alps the palaces of nature, excels them in beauty and immeasurably surpasses them in fertility, the richness of its vegetation and its adaption to minister to the wants of man. Our State possesses, in the greatest abundance and variety, all the best forest trees, with inexhaustible water power, and a fair share of useful minerals. Whatever could be produced in any one of the thirteen States, can be furnished with profit in some parts of North Carolina. Let us, then, teach the rising generation that industry and frugality are better than riches, that truth and honor, virtue and religion, will endure longer than the earth itself.

If the minds of our people are fully imbued with these great and noble ideas, if we continue in the future such earnest, energetic and grand efforts as in the past we made for our political rights, our social system, and to sustain that character for courage and honor which was transmitted to us by the actions of heroic ancestors, we shall yet place North Carolina abreast of the foremost communities of the globe.

THE GREAT METEOR OF 1860.

By **Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.**

[Published in APPLETON'S JOURNAL, January 7th, 1871.]

On the 2d of August, 1860, I was at Asheville, Buncombe county, in the picturesque mountain region of North Carolina. On the evening of that day I retired to my room a little after ten o'clock. The moon was full and approaching the meridian, and the night was clear and bright. There was a window on the west side of the room, covered by a white curtain. The candle having been extinguished, my attention was suddenly arrested by a bright glare of light. It was much brighter than a candle would have been, and seemed like a sheet of flame against the window, but before I reached it the light suddenly changed its color and became beautifully white. The thought at once flashed upon me that it must be a meteor, and I saw its outline through the curtain as it exploded in the northwest. The light, at the moment of explosion, seemed as white as that produced by the burning of the metal magnesium. During the whole period that I observed the light it was greater than hundreds of moons would have caused.

On the next day I made inquiries of many persons who had seen the meteor. It was observed by a large number, because the evening was that of the election day, and also because there was a party of gentlemen on horseback in the town to receive General Lane, whose coming was expected. They all concurred in saying that the meteor was first seen in the southeast, but at a point nearer to the south than the east, that it moved toward the northwest, and when due west of Asheville appeared to be at an elevation of forty or forty-five degrees, and that it seemed

to explode in the northwest, with a great display of light. Most persons regarded it as appearing to be equal in size to the full moon, and all agreed in saying that the moonlight was nothing in comparison with its brightness. When first seen in the southeast, it seemed of a dull or pale red color, and became brighter as it moved along, until it resembled the sunlight.

Persons from the surrounding country made similar statements as to its appearance. Colonel C. M. Avery, who saw it while in Morganton, sixty miles to the east of Asheville, described it as not materially different in position and aspect; while persons in Franklin, seventy miles west of Asheville, spoke of it in similar terms, except that it seemed to them higher in the heavens to the west, and more nearly over them. In a few days the newspapers from Knoxville, Tennessee, and from Columbia, South Carolina, came to hand, with similar descriptions, representing the meteor as having passed on the west side of both of those places. When the *Raleigh Register* arrived from the east, it contained a very clear and minute description of it from the pen of Mr. B. F. Moore, one of our most eminent lawyers. In a few days I saw descriptions of the meteor in two successive numbers of the *New York Herald*, of the dates of August 7th and 9th. These numbers contained extracts from newspapers, and also letters from various persons, at points widely distant, and covering a great extent of territory.

The most easterly notices were from Guiney Post Office, Caroline county, Virginia, and from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and the most westerly, from Montgomery, Alabama, Holly Springs, Mississippi, and Nashville, Tennessee. The telegraphic correspondents said next day that it had been seen simultaneously at New Orleans, Memphis, Cairo, etc.; and while, according to the statement of two of the papers at Nashville, it was seen to the east of that city, it appeared to pass on the west of Cincinnati, and several other places north and east of it in Ohio.

The course of the meteor would seem to have been along a track nearly over the State line between South Carolina and Georgia, then directly above the county of Habersham, in the latter State, near the western extremity of North Carolina, very little to the east of Athens, Tennessee, but west of Knoxville and Cincinnati, and east of Nashville.

I will, in the first place, ask attention to the facts bearing on the subject of the height of the meteor while visible. Raleigh, North Carolina, and Holly Springs, Mississippi, are at least six hundred miles from each other. A few days after I read Mr. Moore's precise and elaborate statement, he and I went to the spot where he had stood at the time he saw the meteor. By means of certain trees and houses, he was able to indicate the line along which it had traveled. By taking the directions with the aid of a compass, it was shown that he observed the meteor when it was twenty-four degrees south of west, and that the point where it was last seen by him was also when it was twenty-four degrees north of west. He saw it continuously as it passed over these forty-eight degrees, but, Holly Springs being a little south of west only, he necessarily saw it at the time when it was in the direction of that place, and he estimated its height as being thirty degrees above the horizon.

From Holly Springs we have a carefully prepared and apparently very accurate statement from Mr. J. H. Ingraham, corroborated by the

letters of several other gentlemen. From that place the meteor was first seen in the southeast, passed on the east side going northwestwardly, and disappeared in a direction west of north.

At its greatest elevation, and when east, it appeared to be thirty degrees above the horizon. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Ingraham and the other gentlemen must have seen it when it was in the direction of Raleigh. Both observers, therefore, saw the object when it was directly between them, and each estimated it as being at an altitude of thirty degrees above the horizon. If it was equally distant from each of them, and I take it that such was very nearly the fact, it was above a point on the earth's surface not less than three hundred miles distant from them. To be seen at such an altitude, it must, therefore, have been not less than one hundred and fifty miles above the earth's surface. Even if it were only twenty degrees in height apparently, it would in altitude be more than one hundred miles above the earth.

Mr. Samuel Schooler, principal of Edge Hill school, at Guiney Post Office, Caroline county, Virginia, was distant more than seven hundred miles from Holly Springs, and saw it first in the southwest, moving toward the north, and disappearing in the west, or over the State of Kentucky. He states its altitude as being, apparently, twenty degrees above the horizon. As he must have been four hundred and fifty miles distant from its path, his estimate would give a similar or even greater altitude to the meteor. Caroline county and New Orleans are fully nine hundred miles apart, and, if it passed midway between them, it might well have been seen by observers at both stations.

When all the statements published are considered, there would seem to be no reason to doubt but that this meteor, when distinctly seen between Raleigh and Holly Springs, was more than one hundred and less than two hundred miles above the earth's surface. If, therefore, the common opinion be true, that meteors are rendered visible only by passing through the earth's atmosphere, then that atmosphere must extend much more than one hundred miles from the earth's surface. This very meteor affords a strong proof of the correctness of this conclusion. It exhibited at first a pale or dull red color, became gradually brighter, till it attained a silvery whiteness, and then exploded with brilliant coruscations, and, as it moved on, repeated these explosions several times. This would be accounted for on the supposition, that a body originally cold was, on entering the atmosphere, heated by the friction caused by its rapid motion, at first becoming faintly luminous, and then growing brighter, until its surface became so intensely heated as to generate gases, and thus cause explosions, throwing off fragments from its surface, and, as its successive coats became heated in like manner, repeating its explosions till it passed out of the earth's atmosphere, or was finally shivered to pieces.

When this meteor was first visible, it must have already passed for some distance through the earth's rarefied atmosphere, and have dipped deeply into it. It would, therefore, seem to be almost certain that the atmosphere must extend more than one hundred miles from the earth's surface, and probably much farther.

I will now advert briefly to the size of the meteor. On this point the evidence is not so conclusive. Persons are liable to be deceived by

the appearance of bright lights with respect to their real size. Mr. Moore says, when first seen, it appeared to be only six inches in diameter, but, when at the nearest point to him, he estimated it to appear thirty feet in diameter, and of some hundreds of yards in length. He lays much stress on the *solid* appearance of its light, it being well defined and without any irregular edges. Others say it looked like a railroad train, while some say it was as large as a barrel. Mr. Ingraham and others, at Holly Springs, say it was, in size, fully equal to the disk of the moon when full. A similar estimate was made by observers at Antioch College, Ohio, and at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. If a body, at a distance of three hundred miles, should appear as large as the moon, it ought to be nearly three miles in diameter. As this meteor was throwing off luminous gases, it would, of course, appear larger than it really was, especially after it became intensely heated; but when its color was dimmer than that of the moon, the deception ought not to be so considerable. It is also true that the observers generally say its brightness was greater after it had passed and had receded from them.

The amount of light it gave also indicates its great size. Major Francis Logan, of Habersham, Georgia, and R. N. McEwen, then at Athens, Tennessee, nearly under its line of movement, represent it as being larger than the moon, white, "like melted silver," and throwing a light upon the earth "like that of the sun." And yet its brightness is described in terms almost as strong by persons at Holly Springs, more than three hundred miles distant. At Nashville and other points, they speak of this light as sufficient to enable one to pick up a pin. Could any but a large body cast such a light over so great an extent of country?

But the most perplexing part of the subject is the rapid transmission of sound from this meteor. Colonel William M. McDowell (who was then, and for several years previous, making observations for the Smithsonian Institution, at Asheville) stated to me the next morning, that, being on horseback and looking downward to the earth, which was already bright in the light of the full moon, he heard a rushing or hissing sound, and, on looking up, he observed the meteor in the southeast, presenting at first a dull-red color, and rapidly becoming brighter. Several other gentlemen in Asheville also declared that they heard such a sound distinctly, and at first supposed the meteor to be a rocket sent up. There were, however, in fact, no rockets at Asheville, nor was there any expectation that they were to be discharged.

Dr. J. F. E. Hardy, (who has since the war been making the observations for the use of the Smithsonian Institution) was then in the piazza of Mr. Cheesboro's house, two miles southeast of Asheville, and declares that he not only saw, but heard the meteor while it was in sight. Being somewhat deaf, he asked the members of the family if they heard it, and had an affirmative reply from all present. Colonel John A. Fagg, who had on that day been elected a member of the Legislature for Madison county, and who was then in the town of Marshall, twenty-one miles distant, in a northwestwardly course, declared to me that he heard the hissing sound plainly while it was passing. Mr. J. H. Ingraham, writing from Holly Springs, says its passage was accompanied by a hissing sound, if the testimony of a great number of persons was to be relied on. Mr. W. C. Knapp, of the same place, says it was accompanied

by a hissing noise. Mr. A. H. Preston, who writes from Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, says a faint, hissing sound was distinctly heard.

Major Francis Logan, of Habersham, Georgia, says that persons there generally spoke of hearing it during its passage in the same manner. Mr. R. N. McEwen, who was then at Athens, Tennessee, says that he and his wife, being in the piazza of his house, were both confident that they heard a hissing sound as it passed over them. Seeing its brilliant explosion after it had passed toward the northwest, thinking it only two or three miles distant, they remained standing for some time in expectation of hearing a report, but not until after they had gone into the house, and, as he supposed, an interval of fifteen minutes had elapsed, was there heard a prolonged sound, as the report of a large cannon.

A gentleman who lived near Asheville, stated to me the day after the meteor had appeared, that, on seeing the explosion, he paused in the road for a little while, in expectation of hearing a report, but that he walked afterward nearly around his farm, and, after an interval, he thought of at least fifteen minutes, had elapsed, a heavy sound came from the direction of the meteor.

We have thus the statement of a number of intelligent and trustworthy persons, who were separated hundreds of miles from each other, all affirming the same fact. But as sound is ordinarily estimated to travel but little more than eleven hundred feet in a second, the meteor might be supposed to have been out of the sight of those nearest to it, for at least eight or ten minutes, before the sound created by its passage could have been heard. Were they all mistaken in supposing that they heard it while it was in sight?

Is the ear much more likely to be deceived than the eye? Are not persons generally as confident that they hear the thunder as that they see the lightning? Why should all these persons imagine that they heard such a sound, when it is not usual for meteors, when so seen, to be also heard? Two of them did expect to hear the explosion, and waited for it without imagining that they heard it at the time when they expected it, and only heard it long after they had ceased to look for it.

It is but natural that we should hesitate to believe as true what is at variance with general experience and with what seems established in science. Solid bodies had often been seen to come down from the higher regions of the atmosphere, before scientific men accepted the fall of meteorites as an established fact. But the circumstances under which these sounds were manifested were peculiar, and are not necessarily to be assumed as contradicting our general experience. In this instance, a large body was moving with very *great rapidity* through the atmosphere. We can only approximate in our estimate the speed with which this meteor moved. While some observers regarded it as being from six to ten seconds in sight, the longest estimate of its visibility is that of Mr. Ingraham, viz., twelve to fifteen seconds. He, and others with him at Holly Springs, saw it in the southeast, and until it had passed to the northwest. One writer says it disappeared west of north. It must, therefore, have been seen to move through a space to be measured by more than a hundred degrees, and it might have been much more. As the meteor, considering its elevation above a place on the earth's surface at least three hundred miles off, was at the nearest point farther from the

observers than that distance, if it moved through one hundred degrees of space in a right line nearly, it must have been in view while it was passing through a distance of six or eight hundred miles. Such a calculation would make its speed from forty to sixty miles per second, depending of course upon the accuracy of the estimate of the time. It could not have been describing a curve around Holly Springs, because it was at the same time seen by the observers in Ohio, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, and Caroline county, Virginia, in its course to the northwest. Mr. Moore, who was at Raleigh, on the opposite side of the meteor's track, and probably about the same distance from it, saw it pass through forty-eight degrees, by measurement, in eight seconds, as he estimated the time it was in view. Its speed, calculated from these data, would approximate fifty miles in a second. As it appeared to be moving in the part of its course seen by me, it seemed certainly not less rapid.

Might not a body moving with this velocity generate a rapid transmission of sound? If we assume that there is some highly elastic medium through which light and electricity, for example, are propagated, might not this body, by the suddenness of the impulse it gave, propagate a sound to a great distance with such speed?

But it may be said that lightning moves with very great velocity, and that yet the noise of the thunder travels with only the speed of other sounds. It is true that, when the flash is near, the thunder seems louder to the ear than any other sound, and yet it is propagated to the distance of only twelve or fifteen miles. On the other hand, though, when one is near a large cannon, its report does not seem so loud as thunder, yet it can be heard to a much greater distance. When, during the late war, I was at Charleston or Savannah, I could, in favorable states of the atmosphere, distinctly hear the guns at the other place, though the two cities are understood to be one hundred miles apart. The cannonades at Charleston were often heard in the upper portions of South Carolina, while those at Richmond, Virginia, were sometimes heard west of Greensboro, in North Carolina—in each case at a distance of nearly one hundred and fifty miles. Why is it, then, that though thunder seems louder than the reports of artillery, it cannot be heard so far?

The explanation does not seem to be difficult. If a pistol be discharged into the water, the bullet breaks the surface violently, and causes the water to be sprinkled for a short distance; but the ripple produced on the surface extends but a few feet around. When, however, the steam-frigate *Minnesota* was launched at the Washington Navy-Yard, though she glided so gently into the water that she did not break the surface apparently, yet she caused a wave that extended itself across the harbor, and rose several feet on the shore opposite, wetting many persons who were there to see the launch. As an illustration on a still larger scale, I refer to the fact that earthquakes in Japan cause waves which are propagated across the Pacific Ocean to the shores of California. A large body, though moving slowly, creates a wave which extends to a great distance, while a violent impulse of a small one produces no such result.

From the smallness of the furrow produced by lightning through the bodies of trees struck by it, and from its passing so readily along a small rod, it would seem that the volume of air displaced by it is small, and

analogous to the effect caused by the pistol-shot on the water; while the explosion of gunpowder, when a large cannon is discharged, produces a greater displacement of the atmosphere, causing a large wave of sound, which is extended to a great distance, as the wave in the water caused by the Minnesota was perceptible for miles.

But, when the ship was launched, though a larger portion of her bulk was in the air than in the water, yet she did not make a corresponding wave in the air which could be felt across the harbor. Even a railroad train, moving much faster than did the Minnesota, does not send in advance of it a great wave in the air. But, in fact, air is capable of receiving such an impulse. When a large gun is discharged, such motion is given to the air that houses are shaken and window glass broken. As air, therefore, is much rarer and more elastic than water, it seems that it requires a much more sudden impulse to create an extended wave in it than in water. If, then, it may be regarded as a general law that the greater the rarity and elasticity of a medium, the more sudden and violent must be a force sufficient to produce a movement that will be extensive, then it might well be that the expansion of gases generated by the explosion of gunpowder would be too slow to affect a medium as much rarer than common air as that air is rarer than water. But a much more sudden and violent movement might possibly cause an impulse in such a medium that could be perceptible at a great distance.

A cannon-ball, propelled with the ordinary charge, is barely driven a mile in five seconds. If we take forty miles per second as the velocity of this meteor, it moved with a speed two hundred times greater than that of the cannon-shot. A spherical cast-iron shot, one foot in diameter, weighs about two hundred and twenty-five pounds. If the meteor be assumed to have had a diameter of one mile, its surface, and the consequent volume of atmosphere displaced, would have been more than twenty-five million times greater than that of the cannon-ball. And, as its solid contents were in bulk more than five thousand times greater than this number indicates, the resistance of the atmosphere would be trifling in comparison with that to the cannon-shot. Even if the diameter of the meteor were but one hundred feet, its surface would have been ten thousand times greater, and its bulk one million times larger. Such a body, moving with a speed two hundred times faster, would present a condition of facts with which we are not at all familiar on the surface of the earth.

The hissing sound described reminds one somewhat of sounds occasionally heard when electricity is passing along imperfect or non-conducting substances.

If electricity be coextensive with the atmosphere, this meteor might have produced great accumulations and disturbances in it, and caused vibrations to great distances. That these should be very rapid would seem to be probable from the fact that the greater the rarity of the several gases the higher the speed with which sound is propagated through them.

Mr. McEwen, at Athens, heard the hissing sound while the meteor was in sight; but fifteen minutes elapsed before the report from the explosion reached him. The explosion was doubtless caused by the intense heat at the surface of the meteor, which generated gases, the

expansion of which threw off the outer coating of the body in fragments. These gases ought to be expected to expand with a force and speed equal to those caused by the explosion of gunpowder. This has not, I think, been estimated as equalling one mile per second.

Such a movement would, therefore, be slow, compared with the velocity of the meteor itself. Hence, while the hissing sound caused by the latter might move with the rapidity of electricity, that caused by the explosion would travel only with the speed of such sounds as we are familiar with, and would therefore reach a person one hundred and eighty miles distant in fifteen minutes.

HUXLEY, DARWIN AND TYNDALL; OR, THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION.

By **HON. T. L. CLINGMAN.**

[Published in the *WASHINGTON CHRONICLE*, January 31st, 1875.]

So much attention has of late been given to the views of such men of science as Darwin, Huxley, and others, with respect to the origin of life and the production and development of animal and vegetable species, that I am tempted to present to you a paper on this subject. Without claiming more scientific knowledge than any gentleman who reads and reflects may possess, I propose to offer objections to the views of that school of philosophers.

To avoid prolixity I shall abstain from the use of such scientific terms as would require explanation to render them intelligible to many readers, and endeavor simply to state in plain language the propositions of that school, so as to present their views fairly and justly.

Their doctrine may be stated in general terms as embodying the hypothesis that the various species of animals now living were not called into existence by special acts of a creative power, but owe their being and present condition to a slow and gradual development from earlier and inferior animals. It is maintained that all existing species came either from one, or at most a few inferior creatures called monads or primordial forms, and that, by a succession of evolutions or changes in them, all animals exist as we now perceive them. In this mode man himself is supposed to have come from a lower animal, probably of the ape species.

I regard this hypothesis as improbable in itself, without a single fact to support it, and without one plausible argument in its favor.

Let us first consider the theory of "natural selection" or the "survival of the fittest," which is assumed to have been the chief instrumentality that has effected the successive changes that have brought

an animal, originally inferior to the oyster, up to man as he now appears.

By natural selection we are to understand a theory of this kind. The fact is stated that young animals at their birth differ in their constitutions, some of them being larger and stronger than others. During their struggles for existence those having most bodily vigor will survive, while the feeble will succumb to the difficulties with which they are surrounded. As the more vigorous only survive, they transmit to their offspring healthy and strong constitutions. This process being repeated from time to time will not only make the whole species more vigorous than it originally was, but it will acquire new and superior qualities, and will finally seem to have become a different and higher race of animals. This process will be continued, each time producing, by successive evolutions, superior beings, until finally man is formed, his last progenitor having most probably been a species of ape like the ourang-outang or gorilla. The first part of this statement, viz: that among animals those having at birth the most vigorous constitutions survive while the feeble perish, has not the merit of novelty. The fact did not escape the observation of even the most ignorant savages, among whom it is sometimes the custom to expose to death infants so feeble that they would not probably survive and become vigorous adults. Though this practice does not prevail among civilized people, yet one may hear a nurse say that such a new-born infant is so feeble that it will be very difficult "to raise it." Farmers understand this so well that when, in a litter of young pigs, one under size is seen, it is assumed that he will not be able to contend with the others for his food, and it is decided that he must be put in a pen and fed on slops, so that he may, in due time, be killed as a shoat.

All stock raisers recognize this principle, and select their sows and brood mares of good size and fine developments. Unquestionably larger and better animals are thus obtained, but while their size is increased, the improvement does not extend beyond certain limits, which seem invariable for each species. Though the hog can be greatly increased in size, he never becomes as large as the bullock or horse, nor can the horse be gotten up to the bulk of the elephant. There is in fact no evidence of any permanent addition even to the size of the species, much less of any change in its organization. When the stimulating cause ceases the animal seems to revert to its former condition.

Though the Arab and Tartar wild horses have, by good feeding in Europe, been greatly increased in size, yet when left to take care of themselves on the plains of Mexico or South America, they become the smaller mustang, and on the banks of Eastern North Carolina dwindle into the little "marsh pony." In like manner the hog, left to run wild in the mountain forests, is reduced to a small, hardy animal. Even with respect to the human race, which is not subject to changes of food, tall parents often have children shorter than themselves, nor have we any evidence that the process of "evolution or natural selection" has ever produced human beings an hundred or even twenty feet high, as it should have done upon this hypothesis. It seems,

rather, that the changes of which each species is capable, are confined within certain limits easily observed, within which these species seem to vibrate like the pendulum of a clock.

But, even if the fact were otherwise, it would not support the theory of the evolutionists, unless it could also be shown that animals would not only increase in size, but that they could likewise be developed into some other species. It is necessary that the sow should not only become very large, but that she should also produce a cow or a lion, or the mare give birth to a dromedary or an elephant, to lend support to their views.

Great stress is laid on the fact, however, that surrounding conditions do, in certain cases, diminish or influence the development of some animals. It is stated that if a tadpole be kept in cold water he will, for a long period, perhaps an indefinite one, remain simply a tadpole, and not be developed into a frog. This fact, however, is, by no means, a singular one. Every old woman, who raises poultry, knows that if an egg be kept cold it will not hatch, or, to use a scientific phrase, be developed into a chicken. In like manner, all farmers know that if a cold spell of weather comes on immediately after their corn or cotton has been planted, it does not come up. While this result may be looked for in all cases, there is another analogy between them which is even more unfortunate for the evolutionist. When warm weather causes the seed to germinate, the plant will invariably follow in its form and qualities that from which the seed came. In like manner whenever the egg is hatched the product is a chicken, and never a goose or a rabbit; so, however long the tadpole may be detained in cold water, when he does develop he becomes always a frog. What the advocate of evolution by natural selection needs to show is, that under these conditions the tadpole should become a fish, a lizard, or a mouse. If he could point to such a result as this he would then have one fact to support his hypothesis.

It is said, however, that if we go back to the earliest germs of life, it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish those in the eggs of certain birds from such as are found in the eggs of a serpent. But the essential fact remains that, however much alike in appearance they may be, each germ, when developed, invariably produces an animal like that from which it came. This fact makes the case still stronger against the evolutionist; for if it were true that these germs of different animals were in material, form and quality in all respects precisely alike, the great fact that they invariably produce different animals, tends to prove that the form of any particular species is not determined by matter alone, but that the mysterious substance or quality which is designated as vitality, is something independent of the mere identity and form of matter.

When such objections are presented the evolutionists insist that mere negative evidence is insufficient and ought not to be relied on. Though it may be true that negative evidence is inconclusive in some cases, yet in other instances it is as satisfactory and convincing as any positive evidence can be. Suppose an individual were to affirm that a bar of iron, if made red hot, would be converted into gold, I might reply

that I had seen iron frequently thus heated without its being so changed; that, in fact, all iron was thus heated while being manufactured, and that it never had been in a single instance converted into gold. Is there a man acquainted with metals who would not be just as thoroughly satisfied by such negative evidence that the iron would not become gold that as it would not by being thus heated cease to be acted on by the force of gravity, and remain if left without support stationary in the air? In like manner does any one doubt but that the offspring of a sow would be pigs, and not puppies or lambs?

But the evolutionist replies that though these things appear to be true, yet we cannot know what an indefinite period of time might have accomplished; that we cannot decide what millions of years or of ages might effect by means of the "plastic forces of nature." To this surmise, however, the answer is that physical science, that science which deals with material things, proposes to rest on observed facts, and not on mere suppositions, like those of the school-men of the middle ages. Its professors are often designated as positive philosophers, and pride themselves on following facts to whatever conclusions they may lead. How, then, can a hypothesis be maintained which not only has no fact to support it, but to which every known fact bearing on the case is directly hostile? If we may assume a thing to be true merely because it cannot be proved that at some time in the past, or at some place in the world, it might not have existed, then why doubt the reality of Sinbad's voyages, or the wonders of Aladdin's lamp?

It is urged, however, that at least different species may have originated in a common ancestor, and gradually diverged like the branches of a tree. The case is referred to in which from the same stock pigeons of different colors and forms have been produced. Unfortunately, however, for the evolutionist, the birds thus produced are invariably pigeons, and never hawks, ducks, or animals of any other species. If in one case it could be shown, for example, that a sweet-potato when planted had given rise to a sweet-potato-vine from its centre, while from its north end a young oak had sprouted, and from its south a pumpkin-vine had shot out, then there would be a striking fact for the evolutionist. It may be said that it is unreasonable to expect so great a change at a single bound, and that a long period should be imagined to effect such a result, but in the absence of all evidence, upon what basis can such an opinion rest?

These changes are supposed, by the advocates of the "natural selection" hypothesis, to have been produced among animals by their having been placed in situations sometimes in which they felt the want of the particular change. When suffering from cold, one animal would feel the want of hair, and to gratify its longings hair would grow on it. Another, to enable it to reach the leaves above it, by continually stretching its neck upward, and by wishing for it to be longer, would have it gradually extended, and in time become a giraffe, instead of remaining a deer or a camel. The ape, though he had never seen a man, as no man had yet existed, wished, nevertheless, to become one, and, by wishing very energetically, had his fore-

paws converted into hands, his hinder ones changed into the flat feet of a man, his brain enlarged to three times its former size, and his spine made erect.

One of the most earnest and ingenious of the advocates of the evolution theory, however, Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace, finds a serious stumbling block in his way when he considers the changes which the ape underwent while being converted into a man. His hind foot lost its prehensile faculty by becoming like that of a man, and was, therefore, much less useful to him in climbing among the trees, while he did not for a long time at least know how to turn his hands to a good account. The great difficulty, however, which Mr. Wallace encountered was that he could not understand why the ape wished to get rid of the hair on his back when he became a man. All men are destitute of hair along the spine, while savages especially seem to desire to have it on their backs. The ape had it most abundantly on his back, and it would seem ought to have greatly rejoiced in it as a protection against the rain. Most animals, as Mr. Wallace observes, though they have little hair on their bellies, possess it in abundance on their backs, while along the spine especially it is thickest, sometimes taking the form of bristles. Mr. Wallace further states that savages seem especially to suffer from cold on their backs, and, therefore, when they can obtain even a small piece of skin they invariably place it over their shoulders. Some of them, as the Fuegians, are even smart enough to have the skin so tied on that they are able to shift it from side to side, according to the direction of the wind, to protect them from it. As, therefore, the hair was manifestly advantageous to the ape in his original condition, and was equally so to him after he became a savage, why in the world did he wish to get rid of it? And as savages feel the want of it so much, why did not "natural selection" give it back to them again? After casting about for some satisfactory answer, with little success, Mr. Wallace fears it will become necessary to seek for some other principle in addition to "natural selection." Ludicrous as this whole passage appears, one is not less amused with that narrowness of vision, which prevents him from seeing obstacles not less formidable to every part of his hypothesis.

It is also true, however, that while he is not staggered at all by the proposition that the ape, by wishing it, could have his brain expanded from a capacity of thirty-four inches at the utmost up to a bulk of more than a hundred inches, or above three times its original size, yet he cannot understand why the ape should have wished for a moral sense. He cannot perceive any reason why the animal should have desired the possession of conscientious feelings or a sense of right and wrong. In fact, such emotions, instead of being of advantage, would seem rather to have been an incumbrance to him while engaged in such predatory enterprises as our modern apes appear to take delight in.

To this view also the objection exists that no organic change seems to have been produced in any animal by its feeling a desire for such a change. As yet it has not been stated that any one of the maimed soldiers that one meets has had his limb restored to him, though from their resorting to artificial helps there is little doubt but that

they desire such restoration. If the "plastic forces of nature" would now supply teeth as they formerly did to the animals wishing for them, would there be as many dentists as the signs on the doors seem to indicate?

If it should be urged that having once furnished the organs to the individuals, the powers of "natural selection" had been exhausted in their case, we may well ask, How is it that no one of the short men we meet, who often manifest a desire to be tall, has, even by the most vehement wishing, been able to add a cubit or a single inch to his stature? If, in truth, the mind of animal or man were able simply by its action to change material things to the extent which the theories of the evolutionists assume, then its potency over matter would be immensely greater than its most enthusiastic advocates have ever claimed for it.

Again, the facts presented by geological science have been appealed to as lending support to the views of the evolutionists. It is said that the animals which existed in the early geological periods were inferior to those which succeeded them in later ages, and that an upward progress has been steady and uniform, from the shell-fish up to quadrupeds and men. Though this fact has been disputed in certain respects, yet I regard it as in the main true, and for the purpose of the present argument will accept it as absolutely true. In other words, after the oyster the vertebrated fish, like the salmon, came, then the crocodile and other reptiles, and in succession lions, horses and similar quadrupeds, and finally man. Does such a succession, even if it were mathematically true, afford a respectable argument in support of the view that each of these classes came from the preceding one, or was a modification of it by the process of evolution? Admit that this succession was invariably upward, does its invariability establish the doctrine of "natural selection?"

Let us suppose that the man in the moon has come down to earth from a laudable desire to learn how matters are managed here. Of course he would be invited to dine with the President. The first dish will be soup, then fish, afterwards roast beef and other meats, the dinner ending with jellies, ice cream and coffee. On the next day he dines with the Secretary of State, and is surprised to find the same succession of dishes. Each member of the Cabinet treats him precisely in the same manner, and so do such of the private citizens as he dines with. Being of a scientific turn of mind, he philosophizes, and is soon convinced that he has divined the true theory of these phenomena. The succession of dishes is invariably the same, and, therefore, it is clear that each dish must have been a modification of the preceding one. In the laboratory of the cook a certain primordial form of matter existed, and through some evolution which he did not precisely understand, it at first appeared as soup. By continuing the operation this substance became partially solidified and took the form of salmon. The action being continued by the aid of time, it was so hardened as to become roast beef. The operation longer persevered in, broke up the consistency of the material somewhat, so that it appeared as jelly and ice cream, while certain watery portions, which could not be even par-

tially solidified, remained as coffee. The invariability of this succession left no doubt on his mind as to the soundness of his theory. Had he not in truth all in this form of evidence that geology gives to the evolutionist? On stating his hypothesis, however, he was told that his theory was so plausible that it was not singular that he should have adopted it, but that he was mistaken. That the dinner invariably began with soup and ended with coffee was merely due to the fact that the person who arranged the dinner thought that such a succession of dishes was better suited to the tastes, appetites and constitutions of men than any other arrangement. Does geology furnish to the advocate of "natural selection" a stronger argument than this lunar philosopher had? If at one time the earth, from its warmer condition, was enveloped in an immense mass of cloudy vapors, so that the sunlight was excluded, the creative power might be supposed capable of perceiving that it was in its condition well suited to the existence of shell-fish in its waters. After further cooling its vapors subsided, and permitted the sunlight to penetrate its ocean, and vertebrates, furnished with eyes, could be accommodated; and as the land emerged its marshy surface was well-fitted for the comfortable existence of reptiles. Further hardening rendered it a suitable habitation for quadrupeds, that could be well fed on its luxuriant grasses and other vegetation. At length it acquired a condition fitting it for the growth of the cereals, and man was called into being. Such a supposition as this would not require in the creative power a higher degree of intelligence than the farmer displays, when, after having newly drained a piece of marsh land, seeing it still wet, he uses it for a meadow, and after it has been thoroughly dried cultivates it in wheat.

There has recently been much discussion in relation to the discovery of the "basis of life," or that point where mere matter first assumes the character of vitality. Microscopic examinations show that there are certain minute particles of matter designated as ova, cells or protoplasms, which manifest a potentiality to be developed into plants and animals. They are found to consist of the four elements: oxygen, carbon, nitrogen, and hydrogen; but they become food for plants only in their combinations of carbonic acid, water, and ammonia. In this form they can sustain the growth of the "protoplasms," which constitute plants, while animals can only assimilate them secondarily from plants. These protoplasms seem to be so near to mere matter that Professor Tyndall said in his address at Belfast, that he "passed over" the interval which separated these protoplasms from matter itself. In other words, he seems to regard matter alone as sufficient to constitute vitality in plants and animals, excluding the idea that there is any such thing as life other than as a modification of matter.

But do the alleged discoveries sustain this view? It would be but a superficial view if we were to assume that the knowledge of the fact that the oak came from an acorn, and a fowl from an egg, explained the origin of vegetable or animal life. How it was that the acorn had a potentiality to germinate into a tree, or the egg to be developed into a fowl, would remain still none the less a mystery. The chemist might

place the egg in an exhausted receiver, hermetically seal it, and by applying a moderate degree of heat he could deprive it of its vitality or potentiality to become a fowl. After this had been done, he would have under his control all the material elements of the egg with its numerous dead protoplasms, but no skill of his could restore its vitality. Does not this show that vitality is something more than mere matter, a something to be added to matter before it can possess the potentiality to manifest itself as a living organization? So is it with the protoplasms. Professor Tyndall says he passes over the chasm which separates his protoplasms from matter. So can the protoplasms also, but when they have thus passed they have crossed a chasm over which they return not again. No man of science can again restore their vitality. Their condition is then as hopeless as would be that of the Professor himself when he once passed from the living to dead matter.

Is it not clear, then, that the discovery of protoplasms has not enabled us to understand the "basis of life" any better than men did centuries ago? How they become living organizations is just as much a mystery as the potentiality of the acorn or the egg to produce vegetable or animal beings.

Again, the fact that the microscope does not enable the man of science to distinguish the protoplasms of one animal from those of another, does not tend to establish the identity of different species. It was discovered long ago that animals and vegetables, with slight additions, were constituted of these four elements. But no one ever assumed that because chemical analysis showed that the flesh of men and dogs were composed of these same elements it thus proves that men and dogs are identical in species, or must have had a common origin. The very fact the protoplasms of different animals cannot be distinguished from each other, accompanied by the other fact that the protoplasm of each animal invariably produced that animal, and not any other, indicates that life, which determines species, is something entirely different from mere matter.

The question may be asked, then, "Why is it that such views have attracted of late so much attention, and been adopted by a number of persons?" It must be remembered that the minds of many men of science in the pursuit of certain inquiries, run in narrow channels, and, like the microscopes they use, make small objects appear very large; and thus they attach undue importance to some new discovery. The mass of readers are influenced by the authority of great names, and are also fond of a novelty. Their minds are confused by the use of terms not well understood. "Natural selection," the "survival of the fittest," "evolution," "proptolasms," "monads," "protein," "the physical basis of life," "correllation of growth," "correllation of vital and physical forces," and similar terms disturb their minds, and induce them to believe that there must be something deep and mysterious in such theories, just as the traveler who comes to a stream so muddy that he cannot see the bottom, is easily persuaded that it is of indefinite depth. Such persons, seeing that they have often been surprised by great discoveries in science, become credulous, and ready to adopt new theories, however improbable.

Mr. Quirk, because Tittlebat Titmouse had, from being a beggar, suddenly become the owner of ten thousand a year, was induced to believe that the red, green, blue, and purple colors of his hair, produced by his brisk application of the various hair-dyes, with which he so suddenly surprised his acquaintances, might have been caused by the change of his pecuniary condition.

The several works lately published on these subjects contain much valuable scientific information, and, if read as we do "Gulliver's Travels" will furnish knowledge as well as amusement. Science, in her sphere, gives us an amount of knowledge that cannot be overestimated, but it has utterly failed to explain the origin of life, the connection of mind and matter, or the manner in which they act on each other.

WATER SPOUTS.

LECTURE BEFORE THE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY OF
WASHINGTON, JANUARY, 1877.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

On the 15th day of June, 1876, there fell in the western part of North Carolina from forty to sixty water spouts as they are popularly termed. The manner of their fall and the facts connected with it are of such a character, that I think the phenomena ought to be brought to the attention of the scientific world. I will, therefore, so state them as probably to make them fairly understood by such persons as take an interest in the subject:

The area of territory on which they fell is embraced in the southern portions of the counties of Macon and Jackson, in North Carolina, and the adjoining parts of South Carolina and Georgia. The greater portion of this territory consists of an elevated plateau of an altitude of more than three thousand feet above the level of the sea. It is traversed irregularly by several ridges of mountains of considerable height, and has occasionally to be seen detached peaks, the highest of which rises above four-thousand (4,000) feet. One of the ledges is the Blue Ridge, which divides the waters running into the Atlantic from those flowing into the Mississippi. The course of this chain along the plateau is very nearly east and west.

The distance from the spot where the most westerly of the water spouts fell, to that of the most easterly of them, near the border of Transylvania county, cannot be less than thirty miles in a direct line, while from the position of the most northerly to that of the most southerly, the distance must be fully twenty miles. In other words, the water spouts fell irregularly over an area of thirty miles in length by twenty miles in breadth.

On the day of this fall there was rain over a large area, embracing the western portion of North Carolina, and territory in the adjoining States. There was in some localities thunder and lightning, but not an unusual amount, nor was it remarkable for wind. In fact, in the immediate vicinity of some of the water falls, it was described as being a still, wet day.

I will now describe, particularly, one of those "spouts" or water falls. Mr. Horatio Conley lives about twelve miles south, and rather east of the town of Franklin, in Macon county. His house stands on the west side of the Tessantee, a stream of several yards in width, and probably fifty yards from the stream. In the afternoon of this day, June 15th, 1876, during the rain, which had been falling steadily for the greater part of the day, he was surprised to see the stream suddenly rise much higher than he had ever seen it at any previous time. This rise was in part produced by the falling, two miles above him, of two smaller water spouts of which he then knew nothing. Though the banks of the stream were high, yet the water rose above them and extended into his yard, and alarmed him for the safety of his house. The stream, however, rapidly subsided into its channel, but was still much swollen. On the opposite side of the creek, and immediately in front of his house, there is a ravine along which there flows a little branch that comes down at right angles to the Tessantee. While he and his wife were in the piazza of their house, next to the creek, their attention was arrested by a remarkable appearance up this ravine distant perhaps one hundred and fifty yards from them. They saw a large mass of water and timber, heavy trees floating on the top, which appeared ten or fifteen feet high, moving rapidly towards them, as if it might sweep directly across the Tessantee and overwhelm them. Fortunately, however, sixty or seventy yards beyond the creek the ground became comparatively level, and the water expanded itself, became thus shallower, and leaving many of the trees strewn for a hundred yards along the ground, entered the creek with a moderate current. The Tessantee, however, was again so full as to overflow its banks, and large trees were carried down it, and left at intervals for a mile or more. This sudden rise was caused by the water spout which I am now about to describe. It appeared at Mr. Conley's at half-after three o'clock in the afternoon.

At a distance of two and a half miles to the eastward of Mr. Conley's there is a ridge known as the Fishhawk Mountain. It extends in a direction nearly north and south, and is probably more than thirty-five hundred feet in altitude above the sea, but it can scarcely exceed four thousand feet. Within two or three hundred feet of the crest of its ridge two of these water spouts fell, but on opposite sides. I will describe that which struck on its western side, and flowed down towards Mr. Conley's house. After ascending with considerable difficulty, chiefly on horseback, but making the upper part of the journey on foot, I reached the spot where it fell. The ground was quite steep, the surface ascending at the rate of twenty five degrees, probably. There was a circular opening in the ground about twelve or fifteen feet deep in the centre. It had the figure of almost an exact semi-circle

on the upper side, and then extended down the mountain, presenting the figure caused by two parallel lines from each of its sides. Across the circle it was seventy-five feet wide, and for some distance down it maintained about the same width. In the centre of the circle, for forty or fifty feet in extent, the rock at the bottom was naked and clean, but around the outer edges of the rim or opening, for ten or fifteen feet, there was much earth lying. This lay five or six feet below the solid ground around it.

The solid surface around the opening presented a very regular circular form, from which had been torn with great force the loose earth below. The roots had been all broken squarely off, and the earth removed so that the descent was perpendicular for several feet down to the loose earth. The whole depression looked as though it might have been produced by the sudden fall, with great force, of a column of water forty or fifty feet in diameter, which not only cut its way down to the solid rock, but also tore loose a mass of surrounding earth on which it did not fall directly. That the column of water was not as large as the entire opening was evident from another circumstance. At the upper part of the opening lay a log somewhat decayed and scorched by previous fires. The lower end of this log extended several feet over the opening, showing that the water had not struck it, but had merely torn away the earth under it. The upper part of the opening seemed to form almost a perfect circle, descending perpendicularly like a wall for several feet in depth.

Outside of this opening there seemed to have been no disturbance whatever on the surface of the ground. On the contrary, the old leaves of the previous year lay within two or three inches of the break, and little fragments of decaying limbs, half burnt, of only the weight of an ounce or two were undisturbed just at the edges of the break. But inside of the depression, and all along its channel, everything down to the solid rock below had been swept away by the torrent in its course. Hundreds of trees, many of them three feet in diameter and an hundred feet in height, were carried along. So were all the loose rocks, some of them boulders of several tons in weight. There was a clean, broad furrow for more than two miles down to Mr. Conley's.

Not far from where the spout fell, the ground assumed the form of a narrow ravine, with steep sides, along which the current took its way. Its course was nearly a direct one, but there were some slight bends which caused, in places, trees to be left where they chanced to be thrown up on one of the banks. Most of the trees had been torn up by the roots, but occasionally a solid oak, three feet in diameter, was seen to have been broken squarely off. All their limbs were gone, and not a tree did I see that had not been stripped completely of its bark in its rough journey downward. The current, as it descended, must have lost much of its velocity by reason of the constant obstacles it encountered from the trees and rocks, and from the gradually diminishing steepness of its path. It all along, however, retained sufficient momentum to carry not only the trees, but all detached boulders, and left the solid rocky strata very clean behind it.

I sought to ascertain, as nearly as possible, what was the probable mass or volume of water present. This could be approximated within reasonable limits. At the distance of one hundred and fifty yards below the place of the fall, there stood on either side of the current two trees, which had, from their being protected somewhat by solid rock, been left standing, the main force of the current having passed between them. These two were seventy-five feet apart. On the northern one the line of the muddy water was visible to the height of twenty feet, while on the southern one it rose to sixteen feet. A tree on the north side, scarcely ten feet in the rear of the first named tree, was marked only ten feet high, while a fourth, on the south side, seven or eight feet in the rear only of the nearer one to the current, was untouched by the water. In the middle of the current the ground was laid bare to the depth of at least ten feet below the surface on which the trees stood, so that the depth of the current, from the highest water-mark down to the bottom of the channel, was as much as thirty feet. But from the fact that the water had been much higher on the two trees, nearest the centre, than it was on those a little in the rear; and these first named trees were seventy-five feet apart, it was evident that the water in the centre had been still higher, probably high enough to increase the depth in the centre to forty feet or more. In other words, the stream there presented the appearance of a somewhat flattened, cylindrical mass. This was due to the fact that in addition to the immense impulse it had received from its fall against the slanting ground, from which it had bounded as it shot down the mountain, it was at the same time descending not less than twenty or thirty degrees along the steep ground. It thus moved forward so rapidly that it had not time to expand and become level. Fifty yards lower down, or two hundred yards from the spot of the fall, this current was ninety feet wide and apparently about thirty feet deep.

Two miles lower down, where it was first noticed by Mr. Conley and his wife, and near the termination of the ravine, where it reached the more expanded and level ground, it was fully sixty yards wide, and in the centre, where I could see the driftwood left on a solid, upright rock, it was ten or twelve feet deep. I estimated that its whole volume then would be equal to a current forty yards wide and six feet deep, all the way across. In other words, a plane, cutting the current perpendicularly, and at right angles, would show a surface of eighty square yards.

To determine the whole mass of the water, it was necessary to know how far up the ravine the current extended. Mr. Conley said he thought the current required fifteen minutes to run by. His wife said it did not seem so long to her. She thought it might have been running at its full height as long a time as it would have been necessary to enable her to walk a couple of hundred yards at her usual rate of walking, probably three or four minutes. The descent of the ground at the termination of the ravine, was perhaps as much as two hundred feet to the mile, and certainly not less than one hundred feet. The French Broad river, in Buncombe, has an average fall of eighteen feet to the mile for some distance. I have observed that when there was a

freshet, the drift wood, at a portion of the stream less rapid than this average, would be carried along at the speed of four or five miles to the hour. As the descent of the ground, at the termination of the ravine opposite Conley's, was more than ten times as great, it is not probable that the current of rushing water moved less than ten miles per hour, or as fast as the speed of a cantering horse. This would be equal to one mile in six minutes. In a single minute, therefore, the current would flow nearly three hundred yards. If, then, we assume, instead of the estimate of Mrs. Conly, that it was running three or four minutes, that it was flowing only a single minute, then we have a mass of water three hundred yards long, and forty yards wide, with a depth of two yards. Hence this mass would contain twenty-four thousand cubic yards of water. From my observations, at several points above, I think it quite probable that there was this much, and unquestionably there must have been more than ten thousand cubic yards.

We are next to consider the interesting question as to how such a quantity of water was precipitated near the top of the Fishhawk Mountain, at the place where it fell. Of course it could not have fallen gradually as water descends from a cascade, because in that event it must have flowed away gradually, and would not have risen so high on the trees on the steep mountain side, nor could it have moved with such a force as to tear up the largest trees and carry them along with great masses of heavy rock. Such an effect would not have been produced even if it had not moved much faster than it was doing when seen two miles below at Conley's. All around the upper edge of the opening the roots of the trees were broken off abruptly, and the earth burst away perpendicularly down in such a manner as it could not have been done by a stream of water falling as we see it at a cascade. Everything indicated that there had been a sudden and violent shock, such as the fall of a large mass of water, precipitated from a great height, might have caused. In the centre of the opening fifteen feet of solid earth had been removed so as to expose the rock at the bottom, and this had been done so suddenly and violently that for a circle of seventy-five feet the earth in mass had been torn away leaving an upright, compact, perpendicular wall standing. If we think of this water as falling in a solid mass its force may be compared with that of a fifteen-inch cast-iron shot which, with the charge used for the monitor guns, striking perpendicularly, would scarcely have penetrated the earth down to the rock. And yet the height to which it rose immediately below would indicate that it came down in one immense mass.

If the column were thirty feet in diameter it would have been three hundred yards, or nine hundred feet in height, to enable it to contain as much as twenty-four thousand cubic yards. Even if we reduce the estimate to the lesser amount of ten thousand cubic yards only, still the column must have been more than three hundred feet in height, and if it had only this length and fell from a moving cloud, instead of falling in one place, it, partaking of the motion of the cloud, should have been rather strewn along the ground.

If a cloud were moving at the rate of eight miles an hour, and one is seldom seen that is not moving faster than this, it would travel more than two hundred yards in one minute. If, therefore, only six seconds elapsed while the column was falling, its top should have struck the earth sixty feet in advance of where the bottom touched. Probably only one or two seconds elapsed while it was falling after it first touched the earth.

The most difficult question, however, is how such a mass of water was so collected in the atmosphere. We know very well that the watery vapor in the air is condensed into drops, but then these drops when they attain a size that renders them barely visible to the eye, descend to the earth, and when they are the size of the common pea they fall with considerable rapidity. One cubic yard of water weighs more than sixteen hundred pounds. If a cubic yard were collected in the atmosphere, why should it remain suspended there until ten thousand other yards joined it, so that they all might come down together?

It may be said that a violent wind sometimes raises timber and other substances having a specific gravity nearly as great as that of water, and that, therefore, the wind might have held up this cubic yard. But we know that air only seems capable of thus sustaining heavy bodies when it is in violent motion, and the tendency of such motion is to scatter water, rather than retain it in masses. Sand and dust, when raised by the wind, are scattered about instead of being collected into solid masses. Again, if water at a high elevation starts downward in a body before it falls far it divides into drops. The cascade at Lauter Brunnen, after a descent of nine hundred feet, falls in a shower. If, therefore, it be assumed that this water was in some mode collected together in the upper part of the highest cumulous cloud ever observed, in a descent of three or four miles through a moving and probably stormy atmosphere, how was it that it retained its compact form? But, then, to account for its having been collected in the upper regions is quite as difficult as to explain how it should be gotten together below. The air above being much more rarified would offer even less resistance to the passage of the water through it, and its fall therefore ought to be only the more rapid. To render this point clearer, let the following facts be considered: If air at a temperature of seventy-five degrees Fahrenheit be saturated with water, it would, if cooled down to thirty-five degrees, let go a portion of that water. It has been calculated that the amount thus liberated, compared with the volume of air, is so small that a single cubic yard of water will only be furnished by 62,500 yards of air. If we assume for the temperature of the air in that region seventy-five degrees, at the height of three thousand feet, we shall probably be not far out of the way. If that air, by being elevated to a great height, or by some other means, were cooled down to thirty-five degrees, or but little above freezing, it would give out its water in the proportion above stated. Let it be assumed, then, that a cloud, the base of which was three thousand feet above the sea, extending upwards for three miles. Then suppose a section of it in the form of a square pillar, the base of which was one yard square, to be extended up three miles, in this pillar there would

be contained five thousand two hundred and eighty cubic yards of air. If this were cooled down forty degrees, or from seventy-five degrees to thirty-five degrees, it would liberate a quantity of water. If all the water thus condensed were collected together it would be insufficient to make a cubic yard of water. In fact twelve such columns would be required to furnish, in this manner, one cubic yard of water. Again, when this first column had lost its water it must be moved out of its position to give the other columns an opportunity to take its place in succession, and in their turns give up their water to produce one single cubic yard.

Again, as to the water condensed in the upper portions of the air, some time must be allowed it to descend through three miles of space. A cannon shot moves at the rate of about one mile in five seconds, and would require fifteen seconds, therefore, to pass through three miles of space. But as we see even the larger drops descending near the earth it is evident that they are moving many times slower than this speed. Certainly they would require more than one minute to make this descent of three miles. But why should the drops in the lower part of the column not descend and fall in advance of the others, as we see the rain do? But again, this water in the lower part of the pillar must wait until each one of the twelve pillars has had time to thus give up its water, and this would require twelve minutes. And why, it may be asked, does the water at the lower part of the cloud wait in mass for this operation to be completed? And then when one cubic yard of water has been collected what is to sustain it until ten thousand more cubic yards join it before it commences its descent to the earth? To obtain this amount of ten thousand cubic yards of water a volume of air must be drained equal to a mass of three hundred and forty-seven yards square and three miles in height. How is all this water to be gotten together in a single mass?

It is said, however, that storms dash the clouds together and that the water is thus concentrated. But each portion of the air resists pressure from that which surrounds it, and of course retains the drops of water suspended in it, so that however the clouds may be moved along by the wind the rain drops will be carried about with them. It is not seen that in stormy weather, at the surface of the earth, rain is any more concentrated than when it falls in calms. But as the clouds from which water-spouts fall often take the form of inverted cones, or are funnel-shaped, it is by some supposed that the water is thus collected and discharged at the point. A funnel made of metal or glass will collect drops that fall on it and convey them by the force of gravity down to the centre, but clouds have not manifested that capacity. On the contrary it is seen that drops of water fall through clouds, whatever may be their shape. There has been no mention of any cloud so dense that the water would run along its surface.

The point may be illustrated by this case: If a bucket be filled with muddy water and allowed to remain at rest for a while the mud will settle, but it will be seen to constitute a stratum over the bottom of the vessel. If, on the other hand, the water is shaken violently the mud remains diffused through the water. Even if a rotatory motion is

given to the water, by stirring it around with a stick, this motion will not cause the mud to form a column in the centre of the vessel. Why then should a cloud with a whirling centrifugal motion collect so great a mass of water together? In fact the centrifugal motion sometimes manifested would tend necessarily to throw the drops of water, by reason of their specific gravity, away from the centre of the moving mass instead of bringing them together. If the whirling motions were so rapid as to produce a complete vacuum at the centre (a condition probably in fact never produced) all the water being denser than the air must be driven further outward by the centrifugal force. But even if it were miraculously collected in the centre, the particles, as they reached the vacuum, would only fall the more rapidly, in fact as fast as lead or any other heavy substance would do, instead of waiting there for other particles of water to join them before they started downward. These suggestions are made to render it evident that the mechanical force of whirling clouds is not sufficient to account for the phenomena observed.

We must find some force capable of bringing together instantly, as it were, the water contained in a large volume of air, or else an influence must be ascertained sufficiently potent to counteract the most constant and generally recognized force in nature, namely, the force of gravity. As the atmosphere is the only recognized source from which this water could be collected, it must, therefore, have been instantly drawn together, or if it were slowly collected, then the force of gravity must for a time have been suspended, or counteracted while the process was in progress, and until it was completed.

Several writers have attributed water spouts to electricity, and have referred to the fact that they were, in some instances, accompanied with remarkable displays of lightning. But it is also true that in other cases no extraordinary electrical phenomena were observed; and even if much electricity was manifested, there might be a question as to whether it might not be merely an effect, rather than a cause. Electricity, however, resembles water spouts in this respect: that they are both involved in mystery. Where a force is of such a character that it cannot be defined, or limited, there is room to exaggerate its powers. Sir Walter Scott said that every remarkable event in Scotland, the authorship of which was unknown, was attributed by the people either to Sir William Wallace, to the great magician, Michael Scott, or to the devil. Electricity and the Prince of Darkness have this common quality, that they are both enveloped in great mystery, and it might be added, too, that they possess this further resemblance, that close contact with either is shunned rather than courted.

From the fact that the leaves and like fragments of wood, close to the line of the opening, where the spout had fallen, were not moved, it was evident that there was no commotion in the atmosphere there. Any considerable disturbance or agitation that it underwent must have been at least above the tall trees standing around.

But the difficulty of explaining this is rather increased when we remember that probably more than fifty similar falls occurred on that day within an area of thirty miles in length by twenty broad. On the

opposite side of the Fishhawk mountain, and only a few hundred yards distant, there fell another water spout. Though I only saw its furrow or channel from a distance, yet it appeared to present, and is represented as showing, similar features to the one I have described. Two smaller ones fell two miles above Mr. Conley's. There were eleven in all that fell on the northern or northwestern side of the Blue Ridge, while credible persons tell me that there must have been forty or fifty that fell on its south side in portions of North and South Carolina. As far as they were described to me the features appeared to have been similar to the one I examined. Those on the south side of the Blue Ridge are represented to have fallen between the hours of twelve and one o'clock, while Mr. Conley and his wife said that which I examined fell at half-after three o'clock. The condition of the elements, which produced those phenomena, on that day extended over an area of six hundred square miles. That region has been settled by white people for more than fifty years, and within that period there have been many stormy days and many heavy rains, with freshets, and yet in that time no other water spouts had fallen. Even if such had fallen within the last three or four centuries the traces would be still visible. Why should such a condition have then existed on the 15th of June last?

But, again, there has been one other remarkable fall of water spouts in the western part of North Carolina. On the 7th day of July, 1847, at a place in what is now Clay county, nearly due west from Mr. Conley's and about forty miles distant, there fell a number of water spouts.

Though I only have seen the channels cut by them at a distance, yet they have been well described to me. Silas McDowell, Esq., a highly intelligent gentleman of Macon county, visited the locality soon after the fall and gave me a minute description of the appearances, which he has since repeated to me. Four miles north of Fort Hembrie, in Clay county, is a little mountain known as Fires Mountain. It is probably three thousand feet high, but as I have not seen it for many years I may be mistaken. Mr. McDowell counted thirteen spouts which had fallen, at short distances from each other, around the top of the mountain. He described more particularly the largest one. There was, just where it fell, an opening ten or fifteen feet deep, cut perpendicularly to the solid rock. He said it seemed to have fallen with such force that lumps of mud had been thrown up on the trees standing around for some distance, but that just around the opening the ground showed no sign of disturbance, and he especially expressed his surprise at the fact that the leaves all around the opening, within less than a foot of it, and in fact at its very edge lay in their places. His statement corresponds with what I saw at the place near Conley's. Mr. McDowell said that he followed the course of the water to the foot of the mountain, and that it had carried away everything down to the solid rock. Some of the smaller spouts had joined this one, and at the base of the mountain there was a pile of timber, and other debris, an hundred feet high, in which were seen trees of one hundred feet long, some of them with their roots upward. Mr. McDowell says the furrows

made by these several spouts varied in width from sixty feet down to twelve feet.

Dr. B. W. Moore says that he and his brother counted a much larger number of these spouts, and that the ground over which they fell was two miles in length by one in breadth. He says that though he lived five miles from the place, and though no lightning struck near him, yet both he and his mother felt very much excited, as though they had been highly electrified. The day has been described as being hot, sultry and close until about four o'clock in the afternoon, when two clouds met at the top of the Fires Mountain. After they came together there was a whirling and spinning around in them, while they covered the top of the mountain, and presented a dark mass, and seemed to divide into fragments in whirling motion.

It seems from this statement that the phenomena were, in most respects, similar to those exhibited in the occurrences of last June. The fact, in both instances, that the leaves and light brush close around the openings were undisturbed, proves that there was no violent agitation of the air at the surface of the earth. When these facts are presented persons will, in some instances, be inclined to attribute the phenomena to the clouds striking against the mountains, but neither the Fishhawk nor the Fires Mountain is, perhaps, as much as four thousand feet in height, while there are in North Carolina several hundred higher, and not less than fifty which rise six thousand feet above the sea level, and yet none of these higher mountains have been thus visited, exposed as they are to storms and the contact of clouds. Again, it is well known that water spouts are seen more frequently at sea than on land.

So many facts similar to those I have described have been noticed that they cannot fairly be denied. A century ago so-called scientific men, because they could not account for such facts, denied that meteoric stones fell to the earth, and resorted to ingenious theories to explain how it happened that people imagined they had seen them fall. At this time no one doubts but that metallic and stony masses do fall to the earth. So now, if some satisfactory explanation can be given of the origin of water spouts, men will not only recognize the fact of their existence, but become ready to accept as true, perhaps, the statement of the fall of frogs, fish, and even of snakes, from the upper regions of the atmosphere. Until this has been done, however, these phenomena will rather remind men of the declaration in Genesis that "the waters below the firmament were divided from the waters above it," and "that the windows of heaven were opened" at the period of the deluge.

VOLCANIC ACTION IN NORTH CAROLINA.

LECTURE DELIVERED BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, MAY, 1874.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

More than thirty years ago my attention was directed to statements that a certain mountain in the northern part of Haywood County, North Carolina, was, at intervals of two or three years, agitated and broken into fragments along a portion of its surface. In the latter part of the year 1848, I visited the region, and soon afterwards wrote a description of the mountain, which was first published in the *National Intelligencer*, of the date of November 15th, 1848. As the article occupies two or three columns of the paper, giving a minute description of the locality, its minerals, and the appearance as presented at that time, with suggestions as to the probable cause of the phenomena, I will not detain you with its reproduction.

The material facts may be briefly stated as follows: Between the Blue Ridge, which in North Carolina separates the waters falling into the Atlantic, from those discharged into the Mississippi, and the great chain on the Tennessee border, designated in its course by such names as Iron, Unaka and Smoky, there is an elevated plateau of more than two hundred miles in length, with an average breadth of fifty miles. The beds of the larger streams are two thousand feet above the sea, and the general level of the country, exclusive of the mountain ranges, may be estimated at twenty-five hundred feet above tide-water.

Geologically considered, it is next to the Lake Superior region, regarded as among the oldest on the surface of the globe. Granite in its varieties is seen in many places, but the predominating surface rocks are of the older metamorphic strata, gneiss, and mica slate are the most prevalent, though hornblendic and magnesian rocks are abundant, with occasionally large veins of quartz, and indeed such a variety of minerals as perhaps no other region of equal extent produces.

Haywood county joins the State of Tennessee on its northern border, and the seat of the disturbance is within less than twenty miles of the line of that State. A considerable range of mountains extends north and south along the line which separates the counties of Buncombe and Haywood. From the west side of this extends a ridge which terminates near the head of Fines creek. A quarter of a mile from its western end, as one moves up it towards the east, is the locality referred to. The effect of the disturbance is visible near the crest of the ridge and extends

in a direction nearly due south, down the side of the little mountain, four or five hundred yards, to the level ground, and across it for some distance and along the elevations beyond. The whole extent may be a mile in length, with a breadth of not more than a couple of hundred yards at any point. The top of the ridge, where evidences of violence are seen, is perhaps three or four hundred feet higher than the ground below. There are cracks in the solid granite of which the ridge appears to be composed, but the chief evidences of violence were observable a little south of the crest. From thence along the side of the mountain as one descends, there were chasms, none of them above four feet in width, generally extending north and south, but also occasionally seen in all directions. All the large trees had been thrown down. There were a number of little hillocks, the largest eight or ten feet high and fifty or sixty feet in diameter. They were usually surrounded by what appeared to have been a narrow crevice. On their sides the saplings grew perpendicularly to the surface of the ground, but obliquely to the horizon, making it manifest that they had attained some size before the hillocks had been elevated. I observed a large poplar or tulip tree, which had been split through its centre, so as to leave one-half of it standing thirty or forty feet high. The crack or opening under it, was not an inch wide, but could be traced for a hundred yards, making it evident that there had been an opening of sufficient width to split the tree, and that then the sides of the chasm had returned to their original position without having slipped so as to prevent the contact of the broken roots. As indicating the sudden violence with which the force acted, a large mass of detached granite afforded a striking illustration. From its size I estimated that it might have weighed two thousands tons. It seemed from its shape to have originally been broken out of the side of the mountain above, and to have rolled in mass a hundred yards downward. It lay directly across one of the chasms two or three feet in width, and had been broken into three large fragments, which, however, were not separated a foot from each other. The irregularities of the lines of fracture were conformable, and rendered it certain that the mass had been broken by an instantaneous shock of great violence, which did not continue to act long enough to remove the fragments to a distance. In like manner a blast of gunpowder often breaks a rock into fragments, without removing the pieces out of their places, the narrow fissures caused by the explosion, permitting the gasses to escape easily. All persons who saw this locality immediately after shocks spoke of the fact that every stone or fragment of wood had been lifted out of its former bed.

When I was there I was told that three years had elapsed since the last previous shock. They were first noticed about the year 1812, and usually repeated at intervals of two or three years. In 1851, I visited the locality again, having been informed that a feeble jar had occurred. As soon as I arrived at the locality, I was struck with the truthfulness of what many persons had told me, that after each shock the appearance of the place was so much changed that it did not at all resemble itself. On this occasion, though the shock had been a feeble one, I found the appearances very different. The greatest evidences of violence were near the foot of the ridge, the branch having been somewhat turned out

of its course. Near this place a rock, of considerable size, had been thrown up and had only partially settled back, owing to the closing of the opening under it, so that the former earth marks were seen several feet above the ground on its sides.

In the year 1867, I saw the locality again. A number of shocks had in the meantime occurred, and the appearances were very different from what they had been. From the top of the ridge to the base it seemed a mass of rocks, most of the earth having been carried away. The depression at the top was greater, while the successive jars had, under the action of the force of gravity, moved the mass downwards, and had forced the stream still further away from the hill. The violence had at one point extended itself a little further to the east. A large oak tree of great age and four or five feet in diameter, had been entirely split open from root to top, and thrown down so that the two halves lay several feet apart.

As already intimated, the mineral substances resemble those of this region of country generally. The top of the ridge appears to be a mass of granite, in which the feldspar predominates, with occasionally segregated veins of quartz of small size. Some of the quartz contained thin seams of specular iron, and there are within three or four miles, two deposits of magnetic iron. Some hornblende was visible about the spot. I know of no volcanic rocks in hundreds of miles of this locality. The only sedimentary rocks are the conglomerates, and secondary limestone in the vicinity of the Warm Springs, fifteen miles distant, near the French Broad river, in a basin or gorge fifteen hundred feet lower than this locality.

The extent and configuration of the ground acted on, the long intervals between the shocks, for a period of nearly a century past, and of the absence of heat and of the continuous escape of gases, rendered it evident that these disturbances were not due to such a merely local cause, as the combustion at a short distance below the surface of a bed of inflammable mineral substances. Though in the opinion of Mr. Fox and others, there are electric currents in certain mineral veins, yet no observations heretofore made would justify us in attributing such phenomena to electricity.

It seemed more plausible to adopt the view that these shocks were due to a low manifestation of volcanic action. If a long narrow chasm had been produced by some former earthquake, which extended to the heated mass below, this chasm might be filled with heated gases, which did not readily find a vent for escape, until they increased in quantity and tension so as to break through the strata immediately above them. Coming upward they might give the rocks nearer the surface a violent jar, which would continue but for a moment, and cease because the gasses escaped through the various fissures created. Such things might possibly occur at long intervals, after the manner in which Sir Charles Lyell accounts for the Geysers, or intermittent hot springs.

It has been often said that volcanic action is limited to areas near the sea. Though such is generally true, yet Humboldt had no doubt but that there is in Asia, an active volcano more than thirteen hundred miles east of the Caspian Sea, and still further distant from both the northern

and southern oceans. Comparatively recent lavas are found in the Rocky Mountains, six hundred miles from the ocean.

In my former publication, it was suggested that if the phenomena at this point were due to volcanic action, similar disturbances would be noticed at other localities in the Alleghany range. I was soon informed that three or four years previously in the south-eastern part of Macon county, between the Tuckasegee river and the Cowee Mountain, the ground was shaken violently for several minutes. A few days afterwards some persons discovered a fresh chasm two or three feet wide, which extended more than a mile. This was in the month of June, and they said that the leaves and branches of timber immediately above the chasm, in places, presented the appearance of having been scorched. Though I was not able to visit the place, yet from the character of my informants, I do not doubt but that the facts were as above stated.

I have also been informed that in the county of Cherokee, in the year 1829, or thereabouts, the Valley River Mountain was cleft open for a considerable distance, during a violent shaking of the earth in that vicinity. The chasm though partially filled up is represented as still visible.

Mr. Silas McDowell, of Macon county, a highly respectable and intelligent gentleman, accustomed to observe and write on such subjects, has stated recently in a paper published in Asheville, that many years since, there was a violent shock in the neighborhood where he resides, during which a chasm was opened on the north side of the mountain which separates the Ellejay waters from those of the Sugar Fork river. He states that the opening is still visible. This locality is eight or ten miles to the south-east of Franklin, in Macon county.

About three years since I heard from many persons, that for several weeks smoke continued to issue from a small crevice in the rock, in Madison county. Not long afterwards I went to the place, and though the smoke had previously ceased to issue, yet there was evidence that the locality had at some time, probably during the present century, been subjected to violence that had changed the outlines of the ground and surface rocks. This spot is about fifteen miles east of the Haywood Mountain, and about as far from the Warm Springs to the northwest of it.

Lastly, we have to notice the disturbance of the Bald and Stone mountains. They are situated six or eight miles to the east of the Blue Ridge. Between the head waters of the Catawba and those of the Broad river, there extends for many miles eastward a range of mountains attaining the height, in places, of four thousand feet. The Bald and Stone mountains, from their appearance, are probably the highest part of this ridge, and nearly equidistant from the Catawba and Broad rivers. My information with reference to them is derived entirely from conversations with a number of gentlemen, and from the accounts published in the newspapers. The first shocks were perceived on the 10th of February last, and they were for the first month or two more frequent than they have since been. During the last two months they have occurred at intervals of a week or two, but have been rather more violent than the average. Within the last five months probably a hundred shocks, accompanied with noises, have occurred.

The distance from this point to the Valley River Mountain, in Cherokee, nearly due west, is more than one hundred miles in a direct line. From the mountain in Haywood, to reach the parallel of latitude passing through the mountain near Ellejay, in Macon, one must travel more than thirty miles south. It is thus manifested that there is a belt of country more than a hundred miles in extent, from east to west, by thirty in breadth, in which such disturbances are observed. In the present state of scientific knowledge, it may not be an easy task to offer an explanation of the causes which will be generally accepted as satisfactory.

Sir Charles Lyell has with great ingenuity and an array of plausible arguments, advanced the opinion that the changes which the earth's surface has undergone, have been produced by causes which are now acting to as great an extent as they have ever done in the past. To use his own striking language, instead of representing nature as "prodigal of violence and parsimonious of time" he would reverse the proposition. Without our adopting this theory, which does not seem tenable, it is nevertheless evident that the earth is far from being in a state of rest, and that its surface, judging from the observations heretofore made, appears to be undergoing changes, doubtless due to its internal condition. While a portion of Greenland, six hundred miles in length, from north to south, and of the coast of Italy near the temple of Jupiter Serapis, are slowly sinking below the waters of the sea, in the northwest of Europe from the North Cape to Sweden, a distance of a thousand miles, the land is rising at the rate of a few feet in a century. Again, while an area of one hundred thousand square miles in Chili, has been permanently raised as much as three feet by the shock of a single earthquake, a large tract of two thousand square miles in extent, in Hindoostan, has been sunk with the houses on it below the waters of the Indian Ocean. Between those two classes of violence, which represent the extremes of slow and sudden action, there may be many degrees of force greater or less.

Is it at all improbable that owing to some condition of the interior of the earth, there may be a change in progress in this portion of the Alleghanies, more rapid than those observed in Greenland or the north of Europe, and yet falling short of such violence as great earthquakes and volcanoes have developed? If this portion of North Carolina were sinking into the molten mass below, solid strata might be brought in contact with matter so hot as to be decomposed in part, with the evolution of gaseous matter. If, on the other hand, there were an upheaval in progress, of this region, which seems to be the more probable assumption, then the pressure from below might occasionally cause cracks or fissures in the solid strata near the surface. Into such fissures of course the melted matter would be injected and by its great heat fuse some of the solid strata, and partially decompose them. In this manner not only would their water of crystallization, and such streams as it might come in contact with, be converted into steam, but hydrogen, carbonic acid, sulphurous compounds and other gaseous substances, would be liberated in great volume. Filling as they do, the upper portion of the fissures, as their volume and tension from heat increased, they would produce other fractures and explosions, until they finally escaped through openings near the surface. If, from any cause these openings should be closed, then

the gasses thus confined would, from time to time, so increase in volume, or quantity, as to generate periodical explosions such as occur in the Haywood Mountain.

Probably in the vicinity of Stone Mountain there may, among the rocky masses and gorges near it, have already been opened fissures through which gasses may escape.

That there will be an eruption of lava, the phenomena hitherto observed, afford very little grounds for apprehending. At the great silver mine near Guanaxuato, in Mexico, there were almost continuously for three weeks, loud noises resembling the discharges of artillery under ground. They were, however, unattended with any agitation of the earth or other manifestations of violence.

At Mt. Cenis and other localities in the Alps, as well as in some parts of the United States, noises and shakings of the earth have been repeated irregularly for considerable periods of time. Before the eruption of lava at Jorillo, there were continuously for three months, terrific noises accompanied with violent agitation of the earth. For some days small elevations had appeared at the surface, and on the day preceding the eruption fine ashes began to fall.

After continuous agitation of the ground increasing in violence at any locality threatened, the next indications of volcanic action would probably be, the escape of gasses, steam, mud, ashes, hot rocks projected into the air, and finally the eruption of lava. It is highly improbable that there would occur any such disturbances as might endanger the lives of the residents, until the agitation had become more violent and incessant, and followed by some other of the phenomena mentioned.

When we take into account these indications at different points in the North Carolina mountains, it seems evident that there is beneath the surface a condition of things that extends over a considerable area. A portion of the globe which, from its geological structure, ought to be regarded as being as stable as any part of our planet, is nevertheless not free from change. Whether this is to be regarded as due to the diminishing force, which, at one time was sufficient to heave up this tract of country, with all its mountain chains, or whether it is to be considered as evidence of a gradual return of that volcanic action which manifests itself still elsewhere, to so great an extent, it is perhaps difficult to decide until further observations have been made. Is it not of sufficient interest to justify the managers of the Coast survey, or some other competent agency, to make such careful measurements of the height of certain points, as to ascertain within the next twenty-five or fifty years, whether any, and to what extent, changes may be occurring in this region?

FARMING AND COOKERY.

LETTER TO COL. JOHN D. WHITFORD, EDITOR OF THE
"STATE AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL."

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

RALEIGH, May 15, 1875.

COLONEL J. D. WHITFORD—

Dear Sir: You are kind enough to express a wish that I should write you an article on some subject suitable for the *State Agricultural Journal* of which I am gratified to observe you have taken charge. Though not myself a cultivator of the soil, yet one who has traveled much and observed somewhat, may occasionally make suggestions interesting to your readers.

I see in your paper many advertisements of fertilizers, and have often heard discussions on the subject of the best methods of improving lands. I have observed two modes of using manures very unlike in themselves, and followed by very different results. When driving out of Rome one day in an open carriage, the driver paused for a few moments at the outer edge of the city. Immediately opposite me on the left side there were two women with white aprons on a piazza, and in front of a house adjoining this several men were at work. Suddenly the younger of the two women came running to the carriage, as I supposed probably to speak to the driver before he started again. She, however, got down on her knees, extended her apron forward on the ground, and with her hands rapidly drew into it, fresh and clean as it was, a pile of manure just dropped. As soon as she had scraped in every particle of it, she gathered up the edges of the apron and started back with the load. I heard a laugh among the men, and on looking towards them, I saw one of them, who had a bucket and a shovel in his hand, and who had started to secure the manure. The time he lost in getting hold of his utensils enabled the woman, who was already equipped, to carry off the prize, and the laugh was wholly at his expense.

I had a momentary feeling of surprise, but on reflection said, "This will pay." It would not, perhaps, require more than ten minutes of labor to restore the hands and apron to a condition of cleanliness, while the article secured might be a dinner's worth of vegetables for several persons.

Such was the Italian mode. And next consider the other, or Buncombe, mode. An intelligent citizen of that famous county lived in

the beautiful Swananoa Valley, and a clear mountain stream, called Beetree, ran just in front of his house. As the surface of the stream was almost level with the surface of the ground, my fellow-citizen being of good intellect and considerable reading, saw on reflection that he could with little trouble utilize its waters. He constructed his stable just as near to it as possible, and then cut a slight ditch to the stream, and with the aid of a hastily made gate of boards, he could at will let the water into his stable. When, therefore, his stable became rather full of manure, he had only to turn his horses on the pasture for a day, raise his little gate, and in a few minutes the stream of water carried everything away, and left his stable much cleaner than it would have been had he used a mattock and spade. His neighbors all admired his ingenuity in having been able to plan such a labor saving operation. Indeed, this operation brings to the mind of the classic reader one of the most famous achievements of the great Hercules.

Which of these two methods is most advantageous to a country? Italy is certainly the most beautiful region that I have yet beheld, but this is not entirely due to its natural features, wonderful as they are. Old Buncombe and its surroundings possess a beauty marvelous to the human eye, but Italy has had certain adventitious aids that place it far in advance.

No mere selection and arrangement of words will convey to those who have not seen it an adequate idea of the richness and variety of its vegetation. Every foot of ground seems to have been used in the best manner to produce in the greatest abundance grain and grass, tree and vine. No land is given to division fences. Even the roads, finer than any others in the world, are allowed to interfere as little as possible with production. These roads, macadamized in the best manner, with their surfaces as smooth as daily sweeping can render them, have, at intervals of twenty yards on each side, octagonal stone pillars, immediately outside of which are rows of Lombardy poplars. But these poplars have their limbs trimmed off so as to remind one of the old fashioned May pole. The tufts of branches at the top are suffered to grow, while such limbs as shoot out from the sides are annually trimmed away and converted into fuel. In rear of the trees are shallow ditches, which in the month of May, on their bottoms and sides, were covered with a good coat of grass. The muleteers paid a small sum for the privilege of letting their mules get their dinners in these ditches. These animals, left for the time by themselves, continued to graze, without ever attempting to step out into the half-grown wheat and rich cultivated grasses near them.

As I looked at the country around Capua, I ceased to wonder that Hannibal and his veteran Africans preferred staying there, to marching against Marcellus and Scipio.

When one travels through Buncombe, the landscapes make a different impression on him. The distant valleys and green and picturesque mountains fully satisfy him, but he sees near him, often exhausted hillsides furrowed with gulleys, which, when first cleared, produced sixty or seventy bushels of corn to the acre. As elsewhere in North Carolina, the impression is produced on his mind that the land

even that has been cleared, is not utilized to the extent of one-fourth of its capacity. When I ask why North Carolina is not like Italy, the ready reply is, that we have not the labor to do the work required to produce such a result. This is undoubtedly true. While land is superabundant with us labor is scarce. What, then, ought we to do? Clearly, we ought to save labor as much as possible, or rather make the labor we have effect the greatest practicable result. But, in fact, the opposite policy has been usually pursued in those parts of the State with which I am familiar. The largest amount of labor is expended to produce the smallest return. Indian corn costs more labor to produce it, in proportion to the number of animals it will feed, than anything else. Certainly in all the upper parts of the State it requires more labor to feed horses or other cattle on corn than any food grown.

When in Burnsville, Yancey county, some years since, I was struck with the richness of a clover lot. The owner told me that for two years past he had fed his horses entirely on clover, either green or cured. He assured me that his wagon horses were thus kept in as good condition as they were when formerly fed on corn and oats. I have seen it stated that one pound of good clover hay was worth more than any grain for a horse, or in fact superior to any known substance except oil cake. This gentleman said that he salted his green clover well and put it up before it was quite dry. He estimated one acre of his clover as worth for horses as much as nine acres of corn in Yancey, calculating the average product of the county at twenty-five bushels to the acre, which he thought above the real yield of the county. He also said that two acres of clover did not require more labor than one in corn, and that he believed that one man could feed in Yancey as many horses by his labor in producing clover as eighteen men could with corn.

This seems a large difference, but a farmer in Transylvania to whom I repeated the statement, made a calculation which was fifteen to one. If either of these statements approximates the truth, the difference is enormous. I think it clear that no one who examines the subject will doubt but that it costs far more labor to feed live stock on corn than any other kind of produce.

Some years since when I was stopping at a house in Haywood county, I had some conversation with the proprietor. He told me that he had under cultivation in corn thirty-five acres, and said that he did not expect to obtain more than three hundred bushels. I observed that the greater portion of his land, though naturally fertile, was hilly and had evidently been very imperfectly cultivated. After dinner, we took a walk to look at a native grape vine. I found it near his stable, situated in a piece of bottom on the creek, of about eight acres. Some corn was looking well on the part near the stable, but four-fifths of the ground seemed chiefly covered by weeds. He said that the land was very rich, a large part of it inclined to be wet, and that having so much land to tend he had not been able to work it enough to keep the weeds under, and that he had been obliged to give up the greater part of it. I said to him, "Suppose you were to cut a ditch through the centre of it, and dry it, and then throw your surplus

manure from the stable on such parts as would derive the most benefit from its application, have you any doubt that this piece would yield you forty bushels to the acre?" He answered that he had no doubt of it. Then I added, "You would get more corn on this lot than you look for on your entire farm, and with perhaps not more than one-fourth of the labor, for as this land lies level and is free from stumps, you could cultivate it with great ease. The rest of your land you might let stand in grass with small grain." Every acre of his land would produce fine crops of clover, orchard grass or timothy.

In Asheville, Mr. Winslow Smith assured me that on one acre of land set in orchard grass, with a little clover intermixed, he had obtained of cured hay, at a single cutting, eight thousand five hundred and thirty-five pounds. The best clover I have ever seen was grown on some of the lots about Asheville. What our people in the upper part of the State on the undulating lands ought to do, is to plant corn patches instead of corn fields. They might thus obtain enough of that grain for bread and to fatten hogs, and depend mainly on other kinds of produce to sustain their stock. In this manner they could economise labor and also improve their farms from year to year.

Even if there be some exaggeration in the calculations I have referred to, no one can doubt that the difference is many to one in favor of feeding stock on grass rather than corn. All animals not at work could be kept in good condition without grain, and even if when at hard work, something more was required, very little grain need be added to the hay.

Before discussing remedies for this vicious or unwise mode of agriculture, let us consider briefly a kindred subject: In former times, travelers would see at a road-side inn, the words "Entertainment for man and beast." We have often read articles suggesting the best modes of providing food for domestic animals, but the welfare of man seldom is deemed worthy of consideration. A highly educated physician of large experience has said that dyspepsia was the national disease of the United States. When I was in Paris in 1859, Mr. Mason, our Minister at that court, told me that a physician of as much skill and of as large experience as any in Paris, said "that he had never known a case of dyspepsia to originate in that city." Why such a difference against the United States? We have as good a climate as that of France, and a much greater abundance of wholesome food.

It has been said that the frying-pan is the great enemy to our people. There can be no doubt but that it has slain its thousands; but bad bread is the slayer of tens of thousands. While traveling in Europe for eight months, I saw nothing but cold bread, nor did I, while there, see or hear anything that tended to induce me to believe that anybody in Europe had ever eaten a piece of hot bread. I invariably, however found, the bread good, and the people I saw appeared healthy and robust. Some, as the English and Germans, were especially so.

With respect to the United States, the condition of things may be more strikingly and pointedly presented by references to individual cases. Many years since, I stopped at the house of an acquaintance,

and on seeing him, I said: "You are not looking as well as usual." "No," he replied, "I have the dyspepsia powerfully bad." When dinner was ready, there was an abundant supply of meats and well-baked corn bread. There was also, however, something called biscuit, which was in fact rather warm dough, with much grease in it. I saw that my host ate this freely with his meats. I remarked that I did not wonder that he had dyspepsia, for that I could not live a month in that way. I suggested that if he would eat well-baked corn bread, or better still, light bread, he would not suffer as he was doing. He answered vehemently, "That he would rather die than eat light bread." I replied, "This is a free country, and you have a right to die in this mode if you choose, and I have no doubt but that you will soon die." I then referred to cases in which I had known people to die from such practices. My cool mode of discussing the question evidently made an impression on his wife. Next summer on meeting him, I said, "You are looking much better." "Yes," he replied, bursting into a hearty laugh, "I followed your advice, and took to eating light bread, and I am as well as I ever was in my life."

Two or three years after this occurrence, I went to the house of another friend, and on meeting him, remarked that he was thin and appeared to be in bad health. "Yes," he answered, "I have been suffered very much from dyspepsia for nearly a year." In a few moments his wife appeared and on his introducing me, she extended her hand pleasantly and said: "Is this Tom Clingman, is this the member of Congress?" "The same," I answered. "Well," she said, "I have often wished you were dead, because my husband used to lose so much sleep for fear you would not be elected." When dinner was prepared I observed that my friend ate with his meat the same kind of biscuit as those above described. "Why," said I, "you need not be disheartened about your health, your constitution is better than mine. I could not live many months on those biscuit. If you will eat well done light bread, or even corn bread, you can get well." "So I have been told," was the answer, "but I believe I had rather die at once than to do it." Not wishing to lose such a friend I talked very fully on the subject with him, and when, a year later, I met him, he was in good health, as he believed, solely because he had given weight to my suggestion.

I am inclined to think that within ten years as many persons have died prematurely in this State from bad cookery as were slain in the war. Dyspepsia is robbed of much of the credit of its operations. A certain individual, more remarkable for the length of his horns and tail than for his friendship for humanity, is said always to catch the hindmost. His agents act on this principle. Diseases are cowardly things and avoid attacking robust or vigorous constitutions, but when they find a poor devil enfeebled by dyspepsia, acting on the principle that when a man is down then is the time to gouge him, they pounce upon the disabled creature and soon finish him. It thus happens, that cholera, consumption, or their co-laborers, carry off the credit that is due to indigestion, just as Falstaff appropriated the glory of killing Harry Percy.

The question may be asked, why should the people of the United States, and especially in the South, in this respect, differ from the other civilized nations of the earth, and even those of former ages? The Scriptures tell us that Jesus Christ broke bread, but much of what is called bread in our day is little less difficult to break than the molasses candy made and pulled by young people. A reason occurs to me why this practice prevails with us, which I have never heard suggested. One who reads the book of Sir Samuel Baker and other African explorers, will learn that the negroes are as fond of fat and grease as are the Esquimaux Indians. They also eat and are capable of digesting raw vegetables, and have capacities in these respects much superior to those of the Caucasian. They have chiefly been the cooks of our country, and every cook, unless otherwise instructed, will prepare food to suit his own palate. Early in life I used to hear negroes say that they did not consider lean ham as *meat*, and they greatly preferred the fat sides of the bacon. Their system of cookery seems to have prevailed to so great an extent, that the white race, with its different physical constitution, is now suffering seriously.

As this practice results from ignorance entirely, why should it not be changed? It is idle to say that the tastes of our people are essentially different from those of the kindred nations of Europe. That children prefer hot bread half baked is due to early teaching. No child likes the taste of tobacco, but by long practice they may be rendered fond of it. As children are ready to put anything into their stomachs, Providence kindly has given them the digestive powers of the ostrich, but after their minds have had time to expand and acquire knowledge, he leaves them to take care of themselves in this respect. If a mother were convinced that by giving her children hot, greasy bread, she at the same time would render their constitutions feeble and cause them to die early, would she persist in such a practice?

How, then, are these evils to be corrected? As they are due partly to laziness, but chiefly to ignorance, the minds of the people must be enlightened. It is not sufficient that an article should occasionally appear in a newspaper, or an essay be read to a small assemblage of people. No clergyman thinks he has done his duty, when he has delivered one sermon in a county. Earnest and continued efforts are necessary to enlighten the public mind. Some time since I told the members of the Legislature that if they would send two suitable men over the State to combat laziness and ignorance in farming and cookery, they might confer more real benefit on the State than all their legislation for the past ten years has done. But the men sent out must be popular speakers; such persons as are usually selected to canvass for the Governorship or for Congress. Let these men announce that they will, on Tuesday, of each court, show the people how to pay their taxes easily, and live comfortably. When the day comes, if the Judge will not yield one of them the court house for two hours, he will have a box placed under a tree to stand on, and he will address the crowd earnestly, like a man who wants an office very much. After informing them that Almighty God created Adam because He saw that there was no man to till the ground, he will discuss farming and cookery.

Of the five hundred present, a dozen or two may be sufficiently impressed to make a trial. One will put peas into the ground, another sow a lot in clover, while a third will put his manure on a piece of ground near his stable to see if he can make an hundred bushels of corn to the acre. Some of their neighbors, after observing the result, will follow their example. As politicians have their sub-electors, so these men should have local orators to aid them, and distribute documents. Every fourth year the whole country is agitated by speakers and flooded with pamphlets to carry a Presidential election. If one-half the effort which was made in this State in 1872, to elect Greeley or Grant, could be made to enlighten the people on these subjects, the face of the country would be greatly changed for the better.

Besides working earnestly and intelligently, our people must practice economy. When I see a lady, who once was accustomed to wear silk, with a calico dress on, and know that this change was caused by losses in the war, that lady not only looks a little handsomer to me, but I like her much better. If the grangers wish to diminish the profits of the middle men, they should buy as little as possible from them. If our citizens would, for a few years, labor as industriously and live as economically as they did during the last two years of the war, our State would soon become one of the most prosperous in the Union.

I have, my dear sir, perhaps extended these observations too far, but possibly some of the suggestions made, may set men to thinking on these topics.

ANNUAL ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE NORTH CAROLINA STATE
AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY, OCTOBER 21, 1858.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

When, some twelve months, ago, there was a similar assemblage at this place, we were entertained with an address abounding in knowledge of agricultural subjects, comprehensive and thorough in its details, and in all respects interesting and useful to the planter and farmer. Such in character have been many of the addresses heretofore delivered on these occasions by the President of the Association and others. I regret that it will not be in my power to present to you a similar offering to-day.

My past course of life and the pursuits with which I have been occupied, have been of such a character that most of you are, perhaps, my superiors in these branches of knowledge. The fact that the Exec-

utive Committee of the Association should have selected me for such an office, well knowing as they did, doubtless, my deficiencies in this respect, would seem to imply that in their judgment, there were subjects within the reach of any man of education sufficiently related to practical agriculture to be interesting on an occasion like this. Having no especial reason for declining the invitation with which I was honored, and feeling a deep interest in the movements and success of the Association, I had no alternative but to accept, and must therefore bespeak your kindest indulgence while I attempt the performance of a duty wholly new to me.

At the first view, agriculture strikes the mind as being the most independent and certain of progress of all occupations. Fertility, or the capacity for production, is a permanent enduring quality of the earth. The course of the seasons is regular and constant, within the necessary limits, so that they bring, in proper order, sunshine and rain and the required changes of temperature. Even if, from any cause, particular spots of the earth's surface should be deprived of their productive powers, nature supplies fertilizing agents in great abundance. The wants of man which impel him to cultivate the earth, are fixed in his very nature; while the knowledge necessary to enable him to obtain a subsistence by husbandry is so small as to seem almost instinctive. Such discoveries as lead to improved modes of culture from time to time are easily transmitted to succeeding generations, and without any very great mental exertions the stock of knowledge in this branch of industry is gradually increased. It would seem, therefore, that where agriculture once obtained a position it ought to extend itself, until, by successive advances, it attained the highest state of perfection. As, for example, it has already acquired a firm foothold in the United States, is there any reason to doubt but that it will expand and improve, until it has taken entire possession of the North American continent, and everywhere exhibit itself in its highest condition?

There are many facts in history which seem to sustain the affirmative of this question. It has been observed that agricultural States were those which manifested the greatest and most enduring vitality. India and China are pointed to as examples, and Sparta and Rome have been contrasted with such States as Phœnicia and Athens, and Carthage and Venice. It has been truly said that nations which were mainly dependent on commerce and manufactures were often ruined by a single unsuccessful campaign, while those chiefly engaged in agriculture could stand repeated reverses, and arise from each shock with renewed vigor, like the fabled earth-born giant from the touch of his mother.

But numerous as are the circumstances that lend plausibility to this view, and pleasing as it would be for us to adopt such a hypothesis, a wider induction, and a more careful survey of the facts, will not allow us to rest with absolute certainty on such a conclusion. Thousands of years ago, immense nations existed in southwestern Asia. Dim as is the light of early history, it is yet sufficient to satisfy us that the country on either side of the great river Euphrates, and extending

quite to the Mediterranean, once teemed with dense masses of human beings. So imperfect were the means of transportation then known, that we can have no doubt but that they obtained their subsistence mainly from the soil on which they lived. But the traveler who now passes over these regions finds comparatively but a sparse population, and the ruins of mighty cities, with immense mounds and buried columns, and sculptures of strange design and execution. Covered walls and cisterns, and dilapidated aqueducts, afford evidence of former industry on a vast scale. The mind instinctively asks what has wrought this wonderful change, and converted fertile fields and populous cities into deserts? It cannot have been caused by any great geological convulsion or movement of the earth's surface. The form of the continents is now what it then was, and the seas and rivers still occupy their former places. The revolutions of the heavenly bodies continue in their long-known accustomed orbits and periods; nor can the finger of science point to anything in nature that has affected the course of the seasons, or materially modified the amount of heat and cold, and sunshine and rain, that visited those regions in the times of Nebuchadnezzar or Cyrus, or even of King Solomon.

As inanimate nature and the course of physical events furnish no adequate cause for these changes, the reasons must be found in those political and social conditions which influence the actions of men. It may be said that invasions and conquests, or desolating wars, have destroyed the industry of these regions. It is undoubtedly true that feeble States are often plundered by strong ones to a ruinous extent; but, why, for example, did not the successors of Alexander the Great protect their subjects for their own advantage? Why did not the mighty monarchies which have since held these regions afford such security to them as to encourage industry, and keep up their former high condition of agricultural wealth?

To obtain answers to these questions we must look to examples nearer to our own times, and to cases in which the facts are more generally within the range of our observation. While the great Roman Republic held the choicest parts of the then known world, Italy itself was blooming like a garden, and filled with a dense and prosperous population. After the lapse of a few centuries it was found to be in a state of decay, a large proportion of its inhabitants had disappeared, and wild beasts roamed over what had once been among its best cultivated districts. Certain anti-slavery writers in Europe, seconded by some in this country, have contended that this remarkable change was to be attributed to the existence of slavery in that Empire. They strangely overlook the fact that this institution existed in all the great States of antiquity, so that such writers as Aristotle regarded it as a necessary element in every stable political and social system. For centuries during the best days of the Roman Republic the number of slaves were computed at three times that of the freemen, while the manumissions under the later Emperors, and after the times of Constantine, the liberation of all such slaves as might become Christians greatly diminished their numbers. If the question, therefore, should be narrowed down to this issue, he would seem to have the advantage

who should attribute the decay of the Roman Empire to the emancipation of its slaves.

A far more potent cause can be found for this remarkable change. The Provinces of the Republic were governed by Pro-consuls, Prætors, and other officers, who were seldom held accountable for their conduct towards those subjected to their control. It was the object of the governor to amass as much wealth as possible, and esteemed a great merit to return with such riches as might enable him to expend at Rome large sums for the amusement and support of the populace. This was the high road to favor and political preferment. The exactions from the distant provinces became more and more oppressive and grinding, until their wealth was exhausted. After their ruin was complete, Italy itself was resorted to, and the ingenuity of the Emperors was exercised in inventing schemes of taxation and modes of extortion. As the system became more and more oppressive, industry was discouraged and idleness rewarded. Who would labor when the product of his exertions was to be seized and given to the indolent and lazy? The people abandoned the fields, and flocked to the cities to receive the largesses and live on the bounties of the government. The population of Rome continued enormously large on account of the expenditures made there, while the rural districts were wasted and deserted. The condition of the Empire resembled that of a dying man, when the diminished vital energies cease to send the blood to the extremities, and it returns to, and is collected about, the heart.

In our day we have a similar example presented by the Ottoman Empire, that "sick man" whose effects hold out such strong temptations to the avidity of the greedy and ambitious. Its provinces, naturally so fertile, and once so prosperous, have been so long plundered by the various functionaries that have immediate control of them, that they are in a wasted and dying condition, while Constantinople is the point of attraction and expenditure.

The immense British corporation which has so long controlled India, and its population of one hundred and seventy millions, is draining that country of its wealth, with a skill and efficiency, and a completeness which throws entirely into the shade, the clumsy methods of plunder practiced hitherto by barbarians. The rebellion still prevailing there, seems to be a struggle, it may be only a death-struggle, to shake off the gigantic vampyre, which will otherwise draw the last drops of blood from the heart of its victim.

The great principle which I would deduce from all these examples is, that while feeble States may be ruined by powerful neighbors, who are hostile, great Empires have always been destroyed by their own governments. A small State, if safe from external violence, can watch over, and restrain within due bounds, its own rulers, but in large ones the central power is so great, and its territories so extensive and remote, that there cannot usually be sufficient understanding and concert of action among the sufferers, to enable them to make an effective opposition. In fact, where resistance begins in any section, the other portions of the Empire can generally be used for its suppression, before any extended organization can be effected. It thus has

usually happened, that the oppression of the government has continued and increased until it has weakened and destroyed, in a great measure, the country subject to its domination.

Having some years ago attempted to present this view, I hope now to be excused for repeating it, because I think it can be shown that the great danger to us in the future is one of this kind. To a prosperous system of agriculture, then, it may be assumed that there should exist a territory of sufficient fertility, with a congenial climate, an intelligent and energetic race of men, and such a political and social system as will afford security to industry, and stimulate rather than depress its activity.

North Carolina has fifty thousand square miles of territory—just about the area of England. But while England, exclusive of Scotland and Wales, has a population of seventeen millions, North Carolina has barely one million. If this difference is not to continue, can we ever equal, or even approximate the population of England? When at Washington, persons comparatively strangers to our State, often have said to me, "So you are from the piney region of North Carolina." They sometimes seemed surprised when I told them that the section from which I came was more remote from that district covered with pines than Washington City itself, and even less like it in its external features. The fact that the principal lines of travel through our State have been along that comparatively narrow belt of level pine forest, has made most persons from abroad suppose that the whole State is of that character.

It was in the month of July, 1584, that the first Europeans who ever touched the shores of any one of the old thirteen States, approached the coast of North Carolina, under the command of Amidas and Barlowe. In the report to Sir Walter Raleigh, drawn up by the latter, it is said that two days before they came in sight of the land, "We smelled so sweet and so strong a smell, as if we had been in the midst of some delicate garden, abounding with all kinds of odoriferous flowers." On reaching the land it was found "so full of grapes, as the very beating and surge of the sea overflowed them, of which we found such plenty, as well there as in all places else, both on the sand and on the green soil, on the hills as in the plains, as well on every little shrub, as also climbing the tops of high cedars, that I think in all the world the like abundance is not to be found; and myself having seen those parts of Europe that most abound, find such difference as were incredible to be written." Inside of the long narrow tract of islands, along which they coasted for two hundred miles, they found what "appeared another great sea," between them and the main land. Everywhere they were struck with surprise, as they beheld the variety, the magnitude and beauty of the forest trees, which not only surpassed those of "Bohemia, Muscovia, or Hercynia," but "bettering the cedars of the Azores, of the Indies, or Lybanus."

Two years later, after a residence of twelve months on the main land, with a party of colonists, Ralph Lane declared "the main to be the goodliest soil under the cope of Heaven;" "the goodliest and most pleasing territory in the world," "and the climate so wholesome, that

we had not one sick since we touched the land here." He affirms that if it "had but horses and kine in some reasonable proportion, I dare assure myself, being inhabited with English, no realm in Christendom were comparable to it. For this already, we find, that what commodities soever Spain, France, or Italy, or the East parts, do yield to us, &c., these parts do abound with the growth of them all, and sundry other rich commodities, that no parts of the world, be they West or East Indies, have, here we find the greatest abundance of."

When we contemplate North Carolina at the present day, we recognize the features here described. There is on the coast the same long line of low sandy islands, probably formed by the deposits of sediment, where the fluvial waters from the interior are checked in their course by the opposing current of the Gulf stream. With the exception of the fine harbor of Beaufort, there are the same difficult inlets which terrified these early voyagers, and on their maps were marked with figures of sinking ships. Inside of the range there are the same broad and shallow seas, most abundantly supplied with fish, and those other inhabitants of the deep, which are alike calculated to minister to the necessities and luxuries of mankind. On the "main" there are lands not inferior in fertility to the famous Deltas of the Nile, or the Mississippi. Cultivation for one hundred successive years, in the most exhausting of the grain crops, has not diminished their productiveness. Though it has cost something to render these swamp lands suitable for cultivation, yet no agricultural investment ever made in America, perhaps, yields a better return; and this fact affords another illustration of the truth, that Providence has decreed that the best things in life shall cost labor to attain them. And yet, up to this time but a small proportion, many persons think not one-fiftieth part, of the swamp lands in the eastern portion of the State have been put in cultivation. When, after the manner of Holland, all this region shall have been reclaimed, the entire present population of the State might be removed to it, without being able to cultivate the half of it. Almost every portion of it, too, is penetrated by navigable streams. Passing inward a hundred miles, or more from the coast, we reach that belt of pine land, which was formerly regarded as only valuable for its timber, and naval stores generally, but which latter experiments show, may, without difficulty, be rendered highly productive. By the application of marl or lime, it has been ascertained that most of this region can be made to yield abundant crops both of cotton and the cereals. Westward of this, there stretches for two or three hundred miles a moderately elevated, undulating country, presenting almost every variety of landscape, soil and production. At its extreme borders, there rises up a mountainous region, with bolder scenery and a more bracing climate. Few of our citizens realize the extent of this district, or are aware of the fact that it is three hundred miles in length, and has probably more than thirty peaks that surpass in altitude Mount Washington, long regarded as the most elevated point in the Atlantic States. Though this region does not present the glacier fields and eternal snows of the Alps, yet their want is amply atoned for, by a vegetation rich as the tropics

themselves can boast of. Rocky masses, of immense height and magnitude, and long ridges and frightful precipices are to be found; but the prevailing character of this section is one of such fertility that the forest trees attain their most magnificent proportions on the sides, and even about the tops of the highest mountains. There, too, are to be seen those strange, treeless tracts, which the aboriginal inhabitants supposed to be the foot-prints of the "Evil One," as he stepped from mountain to mountain. Their smooth, undulating surfaces, covered with waving grasses, suggest far different associations to the present beholders. The landscape is variegated, too, by tracts of thirty and even forty miles in extent, covered with dense forests of the balsam fir trees, appearing in the distance dark as "the plumage of the raven's wing," and green carpets of elastic moss, and countless vernal flowers, among which the numerous species of the azalia, the kalmia, and the rhododendron, especially, contend in the variety, delicacy and brilliancy of their hues. From the sides of the mountains flow cold and limpid streams along broad and beautiful valleys. Though such a region as this can never weary the eye, its chief merit is, that almost every part of it is fitted to be occupied by, and to minister to the wants of man.

Our State, from the seashore to its western limit, is probably as well watered as any equal extent of territory on the face of the globe; and, in all the middle and upper portions, the supply of water power is inexhaustible. In fact, there are single rivers, such as the Catawba and French Broad, or "Racing river" of the Cherokees, which are sufficient to move the machinery of a State. Throughout our entire territory there are no barren wastes, and rarely a square mile to be found which cannot maintain its proportionate share of population. In all its parts, too, the variety, magnitude, and beauty of its forest trees, fully sustain the encomiums of those early explorers. While the seaboard counties have those peculiar to that region—like the cypress, juniper, live-oak, and the gigantic pines of the swamps, fit to become the "masts of great Admirals"—and the mountains such varieties as are suited to a hardier climate, the State, as a whole, seems to contain representatives of almost all the trees of the North American forest, in their fullest and grandest development, and to afford in the greatest profusion all manner of timber and beautiful woods for the uses of the artificer.

When we look beneath the surface of the earth, there are abundant objects of interest. North Carolina has the distinction of being the first of all the governments of the world that ordered a geological survey of its territory; and she has, in my opinion, a greater variety of mineral substances than any single State of the Union. Not only does she present the diamond, platinum, gold, silver, and many other substances, interesting to the man of science for their rarity, or attractive to the lovers of ornament for their beauty, but she possesses in great abundance those minerals which add most to the wealth and permanent prosperity of a State. Though her coal measures are not perhaps as extensive as those of some of the other States, yet they are

sufficiently so to be inexhaustible; while the coals are of the very best quality for fuel, for the making of gas, and for the manufacture of iron.

With respect to the ores of iron, I think she may fairly claim to be the first of all the States, because she has not only all such ores as they possess, in the greatest abundance, but she is the only one known to contain the rare and valuable "black band ore," and that in quantities vastly surpassing the deposits in Scotland itself. When, therefore, we look to the coal measures on Deep river, and find all these ores in the greatest abundance, overlying or between the coal seams themselves, and consider all the advantages of this locality, we can hardly doubt the correctness of the opinion expressed by the most experienced miners and manufacturers of iron, that, when proper outlets are opened, by the completion of the works of improvement now in progress, iron can be there made and transported to Wales, and sold at as cheap rate as that for which the Welsh manufacturers now afford the article.

Extensive beds of valuable marl are ascertained to exist over almost the entire eastern portion of the State, and afford the means of making fertile most parts of that section. Recent examinations have brought to light to so great an extent, lime, copper ores, and other valuable minerals, as to satisfy every one that North Carolina is eminently fortunate in her geological formations.

The agricultural productions of the State are not less varied than its surface and soils. I know of no article grown in New England or New York that cannot be obtained with less labor and at lower rates in the mountain regions of North Carolina. Whatever the middle and western States of the Union yield, can be produced in abundance, not only in the central parts, but, in fact, all over our State. While tobacco may be profitably grown in almost every portion of it, some of the northern counties produce varieties equal, and probably superior, to what old Virginia herself, or any other part of the world, grows. Cotton of fine qualities is produced in the lower counties, in as great quantity to the acre and with as high profits as in the southwestern States. The progress this culture has of late made with us, when we consider the large area suitable to it, renders it probable that, at no distant day, North Carolina will take rank among the first cotton States of the Union. The rice of the Cape Fear is esteemed equal to the best in the world, and its culture may be largely extended in that region. The lowland counties of the east and northeast, as producers of breadstuffs, are destined to be to the adjacent regions what Egypt was in the time of the Pharaohs.

The grape is indigenous in every part of the State, from Currituck to Cherokee: and among the hundreds of native varieties that are from time to time brought to light, after the neglect and waste of centuries, there are doubtless many which will equal, possibly surpass, the delicious Scuppernong of the Albemarle region, and the famous Catawba of Buncombe. With such indications, and our favorable soils and climate, why may we not in time approximate the vintages of France and Germany?

Mr. Webster once remarked to me in conversation, that he did not believe that we should ever be able to obtain good wine from the Atlantic slope of the American continent. The reason given by him was this: the prevailing winds of the temperate region being from the west, as in the United States they came from the land, a much higher degree of heat was felt in the summer than in Europe, where they blew from the Atlantic Ocean. Hence he thought the extreme heat of the summer here would bring about too soon an acetous fermentation, unfavorable to the production of good wines. If this view should present an insurmountable difficulty with respect to wines made from foreign grapes, that ripen in the heat of our summers, it nevertheless would not exist in the case of the natives, which do not usually come to maturity until the greatest heats of the summer are past, namely, in the months of September and October. In fact, in a district of a few miles in extent on the Tryon mountain, where neither dew nor frost is ever known, and which is remarkable for the variety and excellence of its native grapes, they are often found in fine condition in the open air, as late as December.

In the wine districts of France, there are embraced in all about eight thousand square miles, a considerable portion of which consists of rocky steep, and terraces, unfitted for the production of the cereals, and yet the yield in wine is of the value of more than fifty millions of dollars annually, while the product of brandy is from ten to twelve millions.

It thus appears that the whole yield from these eight thousand miles of territory is equal to about one-half of the average value of the cotton crop of the United States for the last five years. There is doubtless in North Carolina a much greater amount of land than this, suitable to the growing of grapes, and may we not hope, one of these days, to become a great wine producing community?

With the single exception of the sugar from the cane, I know of no agricultural product of the Union which is not suited to our State. I do not merely mean to say that they may be produced, but that they all find in our limits their appropriate soil and climate, and can be successfully cultivated to an extent greatly surpassing the wants of our own people. All the domestic animals existing in the United States thrive within our borders. Though the sheep may be advantageously reared in almost every part of the State, he finds his best climate and most attractive food in the mountainous region, while the blood horse can be most successfully raised in the sandy districts of the lower country.

The climate of North Carolina as a whole is eminently favorable. I know that different opinions prevail in many quarters, and so much is said in these days of *northern energy* and *southern indolence*, that you will doubtless pardon a few remarks tending to dispel a singular popular delusion. I maintain, then, that during nine-tenths of the existence of man on the globe, as historically known, the destinies of the world have been controlled by nations occupying territories having as warm climates as our own. According to the settled opinion of the learned, when man was first created, he was placed by Providence in

such a climate, and it would be singular indeed, if, when he was commanded to multiply and replenish the earth, he should have been placed by his Creator in an unfavorable location. Egypt, where man seems first to have attained a high state of civilization, and India, had tropical climates. The four great Empires of antiquity were, in their centres, subjected to ranges of temperature as high as ours. Babylon and Persepolis were nearer the equator than the most southern point of North Carolina, while Nineveh was below its northern limit, and the hearts of the Assyrian and Persian Empires were subjected to a warmer climate than ours. And Greece and Rome, too, were lands of the olive, the vine and the fig tree, and possessed temperatures as high as our own. What people ever exhibited more spirit, energy, and enterprise than the Greeks in their Persian wars and Asiatic invasions? Where has the world seen such an example of long-sustained strength and energy as was manifested by the Romans, when they held for so many centuries the best portions of the known world from Scotland down to the great African desert? After the decay and fall of their Empire, there began under the tropic of Cancer a movement headed by Mahomet, which swept over the earth with the rapidity of a flame of fire, subjecting the principal parts of it to its control. A high state of civilization was kept up for centuries at Bagdad and Cordova, the capitals of the principal branches of the Saracenic dominions. After their decline and the overthrow of the Greek Empire of Constantinople, the period of Spanish ascendancy began. It thus appears that it is only during the last two or three centuries that the so-called northern nations have had control of the world. The extraordinary popular error which so generally prevails on this subject is due, doubtless, mainly to the fact that to the minds of the majority of men the present is everything, and the past however long it may have been, goes for nothing. It in part, too, may be accounted for by the well-known circumstance, that the old Roman Empire in the period of its decay was overrun by bands of Barbarians from the north. But at that time the strength of the Romans was gone, having been destroyed by their vices, and the despotisms to which they had been subjected. In fact, they had long ceased to be a military people, or to bear arms, and had been accustomed to hire these Barbarians to defend them. That they should have fallen a prey to them is no more wonderful than that a decrepit giant, after a century of vice and dissipation, should have been overpowered by a stripling. There can be no doubt but that any one of the half a dozen such armies as the Roman Republic could keep in the field at the same time, would have been able to beat any horde of barbarians that ever crossed the frozen Danube.

I would not disparage or undervalue the intellect, talent, energy and courage exhibited by the northern nations in our day. But Homer still stands the monarch of poetry. All attempts to equalize others with him but serve to show their lamentable inferiority. Demosthenes and Cicero are still the models to which the student in oratory is pointed. Who has exhibited more capacity for metaphysical science than Aristotle, or greater genius for mechanical philosophy than Archimedes?

Whose works of art surpass those of Phidias and Michael Angelo? Who as moralists have been superior to Socrates and St. Paul? What navigators were more enterprising and daring than Christopher Columbus and Vasco de Gama? Who as warriors, statesmen and possessors of universal genius and talent rank above Julius Caesar and Napoleon Bonaparte? The catalogue might be indefinitely extended, by references to both Europe and the United States, but until these names are overshadowed, it cannot be truthfully said that a northern clime is necessary to develop the highest degree of human courage, talent, energy and intellect.

We have, then, all the necessary physical conditions in our territory—minerals, soils, woods, waters and climate—to make us a great agricultural State. In addition to these advantages, there must be an intelligent, energetic and moral population. It is only with our day, that the characteristics and qualities of the various races of men have received any large share of attention. Many ages ago the different species of animals and plants and even the heavenly bodies, were the objects of study, but it is only of late that the peculiarities of the several races of men have become the subjects of investigation, and that this branch of science, most important to man, has made remarkable progress.

The dominant race in our State belongs entirely to the great Caucasian family, that has in all ages controlled the destinies of the world. Wherever it has existed, neither zone, nor clime, nor external circumstances have materially modified its physical and mental features. It has dominated alike in Northern and in Southern Europe, and in Central and Southern Asia, nor have the torrid heats of Africa prevented Carthaginian, and Roman, and Saracenic ascendancy. In America, too, whenever its stock has been kept pure, its superiority has been equally striking from Canada to Cape Horn. But while it everywhere shows itself to be superior to any of the other races, it is nevertheless affected to some extent by certain causes. While the mixture of those nearly related by blood is extremely injurious, and on the other hand the union of races widely different, is destruction in a few generations to the hybrid progeny resulting from it, it has been ascertained that a combination of varieties of the same race is advantageous, and that in such cases there are exhibited the highest degrees of courage, energy and intellect. The ancestors of the present population of North Carolina were mainly from England, and the English people are themselves a combination of the original Celts, Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans. In our own State they have received a large admixture of the modern Germans, Irish, Scotch, French, and other European nations. Such a combination gives the best assurance of a high order of intellectual and moral qualities. One-third of our population consists of an inferior race held in subjection by the higher one. The negroes are by their physical constitutions eminently fitted for a hot climate, and for situations unfavorable to the health of white men. They are, therefore, suited to the swamp lands of the lower counties, where they can labor without injury from the solar heat and malaria. They exist, too, among us in a proportion nearly large enough to occupy in time the region where they are most needed, though

perhaps in rather less numbers at present than the State, as a whole, may require. The negro, in all ages, and in all countries, where he has remained for any length of time, has been a slave, and his natural qualities seem so eminently fitted for that condition, as strongly impel us to the belief that he was intended by Providence to occupy that station. It is, too, gratifying for us to know that as he exists in the Southern States of the Union, he is in all respects superior to what he has been elsewhere. Apprehension was formerly felt lest, by reason of the considerable numbers existing in this country, there might in time be a complete mixture of the two races, or dangerous collisions between them. Intelligent minds at this time have no such fear. As to the first ground of uneasiness, independently of the repugnance felt by the white man to such an union, Providence has by a law of his own, higher than any human enactment, guarded against it. For purposes of his own he has determined that the different species of living things shall continue to exist as separated by him, in spite of efforts to add to the number of the various species. This principle applies to the human race as well as to the inferior animals. Hence, when mixtures occur, they, like other hybrids, can exist only for a few generations. Had it been otherwise, instead of the different races we now find in most parts of the earth, there would have been only one uniform mixture of all, like an alloy of metals fused together. Nor is there reason to apprehend resistance, or rebellion, among the negroes on any large scale. They are instinctively so sensible of the superiority of the white man, and so docile in their disposition, that they remain passive in their present condition. In fact, so wide is the chasm between them and us, that they do not aspire to equality. We have, therefore, a great advantage over those nations that have held, as slaves, their own equals. In such cases there have been dangerous insurrections and most cruel and bloody civil wars.

The effect, too, of this condition of things, is favorable to the ruling race. Every white man is sensible of his advantages, and takes a pride in his position. He looks upon himself as the peer of all living men. It was well said by Burke, that in countries where slavery was unknown, liberty was looked upon as an important political right; but that where it did exist, each freeman regarded his liberty as a high personal privilege which he was ready to defend with the last drop of his blood, and that slaveholders always maintained their liberties with a higher and haughtier spirit than others. With us there is the double stimulant: first, that of freedom as contrasted with slavery: secondly, the superiority of the white man to the negro. Our society, seems, therefore, to rest on the most favorable basis.

North Carolina is often called an honest State. I doubt if those who thus speak of our integrity and honesty, realize the extent of the compliment they pay us. I fear, fellow-citizens, that we do not ourselves, fully appreciate it. As one of the great distinguishing qualities of the Creator of the Universe, not less than His omnipotent power, is perfect truth, integrity; as He has made man's eternal happiness depend solely on his moral worth, and as He has so ordered that in the private relations of life, integrity and truth are the basis

of respect, esteem and confidence between man and man, in fact the very foundation of the social system, it might be well supposed that public virtue would be of the utmost consequence to a State. Accordingly we find that in all ages the strength and prosperity of nations have kept pace with their public and private morals. Even small States, where a high moral tone prevailed, have had strength enough to resist the most powerful invaders. The philosophic historian, Polybius, while a captive at Rome, at the period of the greatest prosperity of that mighty republic, when comparing its institutions and morals with those of his degenerate countrymen, declared that the word of a Roman was worth more than the bond of ten Greeks with twenty witnesses. In the course of a single century these Romans lost their stern integrity, and public corruption and private vice prevailed, so that a republican form of government was no longer practicable. Even the iron despotism which succeeded, though it delayed, could not prevent the decay and destruction of the empire. A great French monarch regretted that he could not afford the luxury of an egg for his breakfast, because each one of his subordinates, through whom the money to be paid for it would have to pass, would embezzle so much of it as to render the sum expended larger than his treasury could bear. Santa Anna is understood to have declared, that the reason why he could not maintain any stable system of government in Mexico, was because the officials he was obliged to employ, appropriated to their own uses all the funds intended to be expended for the public service. The late Czar of Russia is reported to have complained that the interest of the empire suffered by reason of the peculations of his officers. Even the untiring industry, comprehensive intellect and eagle eye of the great Napoleon, could not prevent similar abuses. I maintain, then, fellow-citizens, that when our cotemporaries speak of us as pre eminently honest, they assign to us that very quality which, of all others, is most important to the strength and prosperity of a State.

It is sometimes said, however, that we are behind the present age. If we have retained somewhat more than others the institutions and manners of our forefathers, I trust we have them kept with the stern integrity which distinguished the revolutionary age. Lord Chatham, when contrasting the iron barons of the olden time with the silken ones of his day, declared that he "would not give three words of their barbarous Latin for all the Classics." The earlier stages in a nation's existence are usually characterized by simple virtues and a stern abhorrence of vice and crime. As they become more refined they are usually relaxed and enervated, and are more tolerant to wrong-doers. Already in certain portions of the Union such is the sympathy felt for criminals, that the great effort is to make them as comfortable and happy as possible after the conviction. I hope that with us, sympathies will always be given to the innocent who may have suffered, and indignation felt towards the criminal. I trust that neither capital nor corporal punishment will ever be more sparingly used in our State than they are now. The relaxations that have already taken place have not, in my judgment, been advantageous to the public.

Let our State always be as uncomfortable as possible to the vicious and the criminal. It will then continue, as it has heretofore been, a region wherein there is as small a portion of crime to its population as any on earth. As evidence of the confidence reposed in the integrity of North Carolina abroad, we may refer with satisfaction to the high prices at which her bonds are sold even in periods of the greatest depression in financial matters.

That our people are not as generally educated as some others, has been the subject of comment, but at present North Carolina is expending for the purposes of education within her limits, more, I think, in proportion to her population, than any one of the Southern States, and than most of the Northern ones.

It cannot be fairly argued, either, that we are behind our neighbors in native intellect. Those who have represented us in the national councils have usually, at least, maintained an average position with the representatives of other parts of the Union. Some who were born and educated among us have, while citizens of other States, attained the highest positions known to the Republic. It is, nevertheless, undoubtedly true that our sons have not, while residing among us, been the recipients of a fair share of public honors. This is, I think, to be attributed to two causes. During my time in public life those whom we have sent to represent us at Washington have been in a political sense, reliable men. In other words, no matter to what party association they might belong, it was known that they would stand firmly by the principles they professed. Representatives from some of the States by threatening to assail their own parties, find favor, and have honorable appointments bestowed on their immediate constituents, because politicians are often meanly selfish enough to quiet opposition and buy support by bestowal of the offices in their gift. It has thus sometimes happened that our State has been punished for the fidelity of its representatives. I am far from thinking, however, that it is a misfortune to our citizens generally, that they are not holders of federal offices. I happened to mention last winter to a prominent statesman, that during the whole of General Pierce's administration, and of Mr. Buchanan's up to that time, there had not been a single application for an office under the Federal Government from any citizen of my district. He at once declared that the fact was so honorable to the district, that it ought to be universally known. And I do hold that nothing can be more honorable to our people than the fact that they should be willing to rely on their own honest industry, at home, instead of hanging about Washington for a livelihood. Still our State has not, I am sorry to say, abroad, at all times, the consideration and weight she would have if her sons were oftener the recipients of the higher honors of the Republic.

In the second place, it has been sometimes said that we have not always been so ready as some of our neighbors, to promote and sustain our ablest men. This, if true, I have thought was, in a great measure, due to a condition of things which it is in our power to remove. Owing to the form of the territory of our State, there has been heretofore little community of feeling between the different parts of it.

The eastern counties have, from their position been isolated from the rest of the State, the northern ones connected with Virginia, and those on the southern border with South Carolina, while the extreme west has stood, as it were, alone. The State has, therefore, been very much broken up into sectional divisions. In filling the prominent political positions to which we were entitled, combinations of some of these sectional parties have been formed for temporary purposes. It may have happened that on account of these sectional rivalries, strong men have sometimes been set aside. Envy is said to love a shining mark, and she acts after the fashion of Tarquin, when he cut the tallest poppies. Our people have been accustomed to lament the fact, that we have no large city in which the opinion of the State could be concentrated and a proper tone given to its feelings. But large cities are attended with so many evils, that by some they are regarded as sores in the body politic. They are less favorable, perhaps, to the increase of wealth and population than the rural districts, and are attended with far more pauperism, vice and crime. The general extension of railroads and telegraphs seems about to give to the country many of the advantages of the city without its drawbacks. With their aid one may now pass through a State in but little more time than he would formerly have traversed a large city. By these means our North Carolina citizens can have the benefits which arise from a rapid interchange of views with each other, without the evils that attend the crowding of population into large cities. We can thus have the strength of concentration without its weakness, and knowledge and refinement without vice. Already the progress made in our works seems in this respect to have produced a favorable change. But when they shall have been completed, when one may to-day lave in the breakers of the Atlantic, and to-morrow stand among the clouds, on the mountain tops of the distant west, when the whole State is thus brought together, you will then have a North Carolina opinion so concentrated and energetic, that it will become efficient, and give us that consideration abroad to which we shall be entitled.

I have already intimated that there is a danger which threatens us in the distance. Such is now the strength of the United States, that they have nothing to fear from foreign violence. The evil which menaces us is wholly from within. I do not now merely allude to an organization which has sprung up lately in the Northern States, and which threatens our section. Its governing principle is hostility to the South. No matter what might be the opinions of a man on any political, social, or moral question, if he was only known to be intensely hostile to us, if he was anxious that all the powers of the Federal government should be exercised against us, and for our destruction, such a man was regarded as a worthy member of the organization. To suppose that the South would willingly submit to be governed by such a party, would be an implication that she wanted the common instincts of humanity. No man is to be expected to submit himself, if he can by any possibility avoid it, to the control of one whose only principle is enmity to him. Waving for the present, however, all thought of this danger, there is in the future, ground for

apprehending evil to all the members of the confederacy. We have seen that great nations have, in the end, suffered most from the exactions of their governments. Were this a consolidated republic it could not hope to escape, for a long period, the fate of those which have preceded it. In the organization of our system, however, it has been most wisely arranged, that the powers of the central government should be limited and well defined. Two main reasons led to its formation: The first object was to enable it to manage the foreign relations of the States, and hence it was invested with the power to make war against and treaties with foreign nations, and to regulate commerce with them. A second prominent object was to prevent collisions and misunderstandings between the States themselves, and it was authorized to regulate commerce between them, coin money, etc. Most of the leading powers belonging to it fall within these classes. It was, however, invested with certain other attributes, not of the first magnitude, but which it could conveniently and advantageously exercise. In order, too, that it might have the means of sustaining itself, and perform the functions assigned to it, it was invested with full power to raise revenue by taxation, and with no limit, except what its legitimate wants might fairly require. All other powers were retained by the States.

Notwithstanding the care and foresight manifested by its founders, it has, nevertheless, greatly increased its strength since its formation. This is due, not so much to its having assumed new powers. (for the attempts made in that direction have been on the whole pretty successfully resisted,) as to the practices which have grown up under it. Combinations have been formed by certain classes to make use of its powers for their own advantage. I will refer to a few examples to make it manifest that it is treading, to some extent, in the foot-prints of its predecessors in the world. Bounties are given to those engaged in certain kinds of fisheries, and these by no means the most difficult and dangerous. It cannot be shown that those thus employed are more meritorious than are the classes taxed for their benefit. The original excuse given for this measure, that it was necessary to create a navy, no longer exists, because we have a commercial marine equal to that of the first nation in the world; and it is a singular fact that other branches even of the fisheries have increased much faster than those favored ones. In the second place, our navigation laws are unjust to all, except those engaged in commerce. If the agriculturist wishes to transport his grain, cotton, or tobacco from one part of the Union to another, why should he not send it in the ship which will carry it cheapest? Or if one of our merchants should wish to have goods, purchased by him, brought from New York to Wilmington, and a foreign ship is willing to bring them for one-half the price that American vessels charge, why should not he be permitted to employ it? If one of our citizens wishes to buy a ship, why not allow him to purchase where he can do it the cheapest? These restrictions are all intended for the benefit of northeastern ship-owners and builders, and oppress the agriculturist.

The most injurious of all measures of the government, however, to the planters and farmers, is that arising from the manner in which the tariff taxes have been imposed. Any just system of taxation ought to be made as equal as possible, whereas, in fact, this has generally been made the reverse. Certain classes wishing to escape all the burdens of supporting the government, and to derive profit from the system, have, by their activity and industry, succeeded in rendering it in the highest degree unequal. It thus happens that when the American people are made to pay more than sixty millions to the federal government annually, they likewise pay a still larger sum to the manufacturers. The excuse for this is, that American labor must be protected. But are not the agriculturalists, who toil in the sun, *laborers*? If so, why should they be taxed for the benefit of the manufacturers?

Again, a powerful combination has been formed to carry out a system of internal improvement by the federal government. When, at the formation of the Constitution, power was given to regulate commerce, this was well understood to mean only the right to pass laws for the regulation of trading vessels, &c., and it was never dreamed that under it the government was to have the authority to make harbors where nature had not provided them, open rivers, and build roads. As managed, in fact, it has been a mere combination to plunder the treasury for the private advantage of the parties. Appropriations, too, are made to build expensive custom-houses in the interior of the country, a thousand miles from the frontier, where the imports are in fact made. As the goods have to be carried by the custom-houses on the frontier, it is a mere mockery to pretend that any just reason exists for such expenditures. They are known to be made solely to gratify the pride of certain cities, to give jobs to contractors, and employment to workmen. For a like reason government post offices are required to be built. After most of those who have fought through the wars are dead, strong efforts are made to get pensions for them. It is notorious, that the main pressure on Congress to enlarge the system enormously comes from the speculators who are employed as pension agents, and who make large profits by their operations. In some years, the printing of comparatively worthless books exceeds the expenses of the entire government in its earlier days. Every pretence, too, is sought to create new offices and enlarge salaries. There are already powerful combinations of those who expect to make a living out of the government. A large portion of this mischief, undoubtedly, arises from the action of those who represent the manufacturing interest, and who labor to cause the government to waste as much money as possible, so as to afford an excuse to raise or keep up the tariff taxes. I refer to these things to make it appear that our government is traveling the path of those which have gone before it. But it is sometimes said that the diffusion of education, newspapers and universal suffrage will protect us. If any one thinks so, let him look to the city of New York. There are in abundance newspapers, intelligence and universal suffrage, and yet that community, in spite of its efforts, is oppressed by an enormous system of taxation, the proceeds of which are mainly wasted. If a small locality like this cannot pro-

tect itself, what might we expect in this extended Union, if the powers of its government were all consolidated at Washington.

Seeing the progress already made under our system, I should despair of its being arrested, but for one consideration. There is a limit to the sum that can be raised by the tariff taxes, as it depends on the amount of the imports, and I doubt if the people would bear a heavy system of direct taxation. It is this thought that gives the most hope. Let things go on as they may, however, it is our duty to use all the means in our power to arrest the evil by restraining the action of the central government within proper limits. From the past conduct of North Carolina and the present feeling of her people, I look upon her as among the most reliable of the States in this cause.

There are, too, fellow-citizens, incidents in our history which may well be brought to mind on an occasion like this. The first explorations and settlement of our territory were made under the auspices of one with whom any community might feel proud to be associated. When you consider his great abilities, both as a military and a naval commander, his talent and sagacity as a statesman, his varied learning and knowledge, so much in advance of his times, his accomplishments as a courtier, his lofty spirit fully imbued with the tone of that departing chivalry which could lend even to error itself a halo of glory, his high courage and daring, and generous and noble traits in private life, Sir Walter Raleigh was, by all odds, the first man of his day in England, bright as that day was. After the settlement of the colony of North Carolina, its inhabitants were remarkable for their love of independence and their capacity to govern themselves. As our character as a frank and candid, quiet and well ordered and industrious community is so fully established, we can, without any feelings of uneasiness or sensitiveness, recur to such statements as these. In the year 1731 the Colonial Governor, Burrington, in an official dispatch to his home government says: "The people of North Carolina are neither to be cajoled nor outwitted. Whenever a governor attempts to effect anything by this means, he will lose his labor and show his ignorance."

"The inhabitants of North Carolina are not industrious, but subtle and crafty; always behaved insolently to their governors; some they have imprisoned, others they have drove out of the country, and at other times set up a governor of their own choice, supported by men and arms."

When the dividing line was run between Virginia and North Carolina, one of the commissioners appointed by the former State, William Byrd, in his "History of the Dividing Line," says: "The borderers laid it to heart if their land was taken in Virginia; they chose much rather to belong to Carolina, where they pay no tribute to God or to Cæsar."

As he may have felt a pique against the borderers, and jealousy towards a State preferred to his own, his words ought probably to be accepted with grains of allowance. We will therefore take only half the statement to be true—the *latter half*—for those who are readiest to resist the demand of an usurping despot, are the most likely to render the homage due to the Creator and Governor of the Universe. We should naturally expect such a people to be among the first and boldest to resist those aggressions of Great Britain which led to the Revolution. Accordingly, in the year 1765, on the passage of the Stamp Act, Colonel John Ashe,

Speaker of the House of Commons of North Carolina, informed Governor Tryon that the law would be *resisted to every extent*. On the arrival of the British sloop-of-war *Diligence* in the Cape Fear, he and Colonel Waddell, at the head of a body of the citizens of the counties of New Hanover and Brunswick, marched down in a body, frightened the captain of the ship so that he did not attempt to land the stamp paper, seized her boat and carried it, with flags flying, to Wilmington, and the whole town was illuminated that night. On the next day they marched to the Governor's house and demanded that Governor Tryon should desist from all attempts to execute the Stamp Act, and obliged him to deliver up Houston, the stamp-master for North Carolina. Having seized upon him, they carried him to the public market-house and compelled him to take an oath never to attempt to execute his office as stamp-master.

It was nearly ten years after this act that the Boston tea party assembled, when a number of citizens, disguised as Indians, went on board a ship and threw overboard the tea imported in her. This latter act was done in the night, by men in disguise, and was directed against a defenceless ship. But the North Carolina movement, ten years earlier in point of time, occurred in open day, and was made against the Governor himself, ensconced in his palace, and by men who scorned all disguise. While both deeds were meritorious on account of their daring, and also the motives of the actors, that at Boston partook of the stealthy manner of the cautious fox, while the North Carolina act resembled the lofty bearing of the lordly lion, whose defiant roar sends challenge loud to all that oppose his way. And yet the one occurrence has been lauded unsparingly, while the other is scarcely known out of the limits of our State. Historians, whose main object has been to elevate other States, have ignored it, because of its brilliancy. It has been suggested, however, by way of excuse for this, that the tea movement led immediately to a collision of arms. But will any man pretend that a blow which merely irritates an adversary and causes him to make an attack, is more meritorious than one so decided as to overawe him and compel him to retreat?

The same spirit continued to animate our people, and led to the uprising of the Regulators to resist the oppressive taxation and exactions of the colonial government. It was on the 16th day of May, 1771, that the battle of the Alamance was fought, in which more than three thousand men were engaged. Here occurred the first collision of arms between Great Britain and her rebellious colonies, and here was shed the first blood of the American Revolution. Though superiority of arms and discipline enabled Governor Tryon to win the victory, yet such was the terror inspired by the movement, that he required the people, in all the middle and upper parts of the State, to be drawn out in battalions, and to take an oath of allegiance to the British Government. In addition to this, the prominent men who were most suspected, were notified from time to time to appear at each Court, and renew the oath to sustain the Government. As the contest waxed warmer and warmer between the colonies and the mother country, the spirit of our people continued to rise. And on the 20th of May, 1775, the citizens of Mecklenburg, more than a year in advance of the general declaration, proclaimed Indepen-

dence, and, at a subsequent meeting, perfected their system of Government. The conduct of her sons throughout the whole struggle vindicated the opinion expressed by Lord Cornwallis and Colonel Tarleton, that Mecklenburg was the most rebellious county in America. Such a county was a fitting birth-place for Andrew Jackson.

As the first blood of the Revolutionary contest had been shed in our State, so in it the first victory was won, in the well-fought battle of Moore's Creek, on the 27th of February, 1776. Nor were the exertions of our citizens confined to their own territory. General Francis Nash and Colonel Edward Buncombe gave up their lives on the soil of Pennsylvania, and at the battle of Eutaw the North Carolina militia maintained the fight, in the open field, against a greatly superior force of British regulars, so long, and so obstinately refused to retire, when ordered by their officers, that the Commander-in-Chief declared that their conduct would have done to honor Prussian veterans. And when the gloomy cloud of British domination was moving steadily on from the northeast, like the dark shadow of an eclipse, it paused before it reached our western border. The tide of our enemies' success recoiled from the base of those "unknown mountains," and became reflux when Ferguson fell. Soon after, in the bloody battle of Guilford, the power of Cornwallis, the ablest and most dangerous of our enemies, was broken, and he retired, with drooping spirits, to the sea-side, to become a captive.

That North Carolina declined, for two nearly two years after its formation, to become a member of our present Union, is in no respect to her discredit. Having profited by her own experience, she was slow to part with the right of absolute self-government, and finally, only adopted the Federal Constitution after important amendments had been made. And should it, from any cause, fail to afford her that protection to which she is entitled, the spirit which animated her early colonists, which resisted the Stamp Act and other British aggressions, and rose still higher at Mecklenburg and King's Mountain, will again be ready to vindicate the great principles of civil liberty. That she may be spared the necessity of new exertions to that end, ought to be the wish of all her sons. The whole human race is largely interested in the result of our present system; and should it be successful, there will be presented such an empire of confederated sovereignties as has never yet existed on the face of the globe.

SPEECH

DELIVERED AT THE CHARLOTTE CENTENNIAL, MAY 20, 1875.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

After General Cox, Hon. Thos. L. Clingman was called for and spoke as follows:

GENTLEMEN:—You have been truthfully told by the eloquent speakers who have preceded me to-day, that North Carolina was the first of the colonies to appeal to arms against Great Britain, and the first to declare independence. There is nothing left for me to add on this point. Even if I had been the first speaker, I doubt if I should have deemed it necessary to argue the last of these questions, for I have never seen or heard of but three North Carolinians who professed to have doubts on the subject, and for the sake of contrast I am quite willing that they should go in a set by themselves.

During the discussions of the day, one consideration presented itself to my mind which ought to be gratifying to us all. When the war of the Revolution began, the free white population of the colonies was very nearly two millions and a half, and yet General Washington's army sometimes was allowed to dwindle down to two or three thousand men. Why was this? The people of these colonies had been accustomed only to live under a monarchy, and practically knew no other government. There were intelligent, high-toned, brave men who led in the movement, and to whose efforts its success was chiefly due, but the masses were, in the main, so slow, careless, indifferent, or divided, that Lord Cornwallis was surprised when he found a community like that of Mecklenburg all arrayed against him.

A century has passed by, and what has been the result? Has the enjoyment of constitutional government and free institutions caused us to degenerate? Why, in our late civil war, our whole population, whatever might be the side they espoused, seemed ready to embark in the contest.

North Carolina alone, with a white population of little more than six hundred thousand, or only one-fourth of that of all the colonies, if you compute the length of the service of her men, placed in the field more troops than all the old thirteen States did, nor have I a doubt but that she had twice as many men killed in battle as all those that were slain on the American side during the entire revolutionary struggle. Why one of our North Carolina brigades would probably have arrested the march of Cornwallis across the State. I have little doubt but that the brigade I commanded so long, many surviving members of which I have seen here assembled to-day, would, if present at Guilford Court House, by

one of its charges, have relieved Lord Cornwallis of the necessity of marching all the way up to Yorktown to find some one to capture him.

The difference between our people of revolutionary times and those of the present day, is to be attributed partly to our experience of the advantages of free institutions, and also to that general diffusion of intelligence and public spirit, which the great material progress around us has produced by means of such instrumentalities as railroads, telegraphs and a widely extended press.

Our civil war, too, has strikingly presented the contrast between the United States and European nations. In the year 1859 I was in Italy during a great war waged by France and Italy against Austria, and two battles, which occurred in the same month, decided the contest. A few years later, the power of the Austrian empire, with seven or eight hundred thousand men, was broken in a single battle at Sadowa. In the more recent war between France and Germany, the French Emperor, at Sedan, surrendered in the open field one hundred and thirty thousand men. Just think of one hundred and thirty thousand men surrendered in the open field. Why, I doubt if General Grant, even, ever had as large a number of men as that present in a single engagement under his eye, while General Lee never had half that number present at one time. How striking the difference between Europe and the United States. Men who fight for a king fight feebly, with little heart, and are easily subdued, but in a republic each citizen feels that he is fighting for himself and for his own country. It thus happens that the entire strength of the country is called into action. Nor does any other condition so greatly develop material progress. When in London, I happened, during a conversation with Lord Macaulay, one of the best informed men in Europe, to say that the United States had as many miles of railroad as all the rest of the world, and he seemed surprised to learn the fact.

Our late war developed all that was most striking in ancient or modern warfare. When at sunrise on the field of Waterloo, Napoleon saw that Wellington's army, instead of having retreated, as he had apprehended it would do, was in position before him, he exclaimed, "We have them, these English!" Marshal Soult, who had been fighting them for years in Portugal and Spain, said, "Sire, the infantry of England in battle is the devil." Napoleon, at the close of the day, found this to be true, and at St. Helena, referring to their steady resistance under attack, said, "There is no moving them." But nothing that England's soldiers ever did, surpassed the unshaken courage of our North Carolina Confederates under the most formidable assaults. On more than one occasion, when attacked again and again, at the same time in front and flank, by more than ten times its numbers, one of its brigades remained unbroken.

But the most striking feature of the late war was the Confederate charge. The student will remember that at Marathon the Athenians for the first time made a wild dash against the mass of their enemies. Julius Caesar said that Pompey, at Pharsalia, made a great mistake in not allowing his men to go into the battle with a running charge. This mode of fighting had, however, gone into disuse in the world for centuries, and was revived only in our day by the Confederate soldiers. When after the seven days' fight at Richmond, the Orleans Princes returned to Europe, to account for McClellan's defeat they referred to this feature,

and said that people in Europe could have no idea of the effect of a charge extending over a length of three miles. Our friend, General D. H. Hill, if present, could tell us all about this. Often as I witnessed this charge, I never saw it fail to break and carry down the force against which it was directed.

If we wish our country to be the greatest in war and in peace, the first in material progress and the grandest in public spirit and patriotism, we must preserve a free system of constitutional government. I say to gentlemen of the North here present, as well as those of the South, that this is our highest duty to our country and to humanity. In such a cause, we here present are fully prepared to co-operate with them.

On this point I speak as a Confederate who did not abandon the contest till its close. That they may understand what sort of a Confederate I was, I may, perhaps, repeat without impropriety a conversation with General Joseph E. Johnston, which not long since he well remembered. Just before the surrender at Greensboro, I said to him, "General, much has been said about dying in the last ditch; you have still left with you here fourteen thousand of as brave men as the sun ever shone upon; let us stand here and fight the two armies of Grant and Sherman, and thus show to the world how far we can surpass the Thermopylæ of the Greeks." He remained in silent thought for some moments, as if hesitating, and thus answered, "General, if they were all like you, I would do it, but there are many young men here who have a future, and I ought not to sacrifice their lives." I then, and sometimes since, have felt, as doubtless many other Confederates have done, a regret that I had not fallen in the last battle. I say to gentlemen from the North, that since the day of that surrender, I have not met one North Carolinian who expressed a desire to renew the war against the United States. We have regarded the contest as finally settled, as after a Presidential election the party beaten acquiesce in the result and stand by the government of their country administered by one against whom they had voted.

It never was pretended that men were disloyal to the country because they might have voted for Greely, or Seymour, or Scott, or Clay, unless they would come forward and declare that they had been wrong and were sorry for what they had done. While, as far as I know, our citizens are satisfied that they did right in the late war; but having been beaten, they are willing now to join cordially with those to whom they were once opposed, in all honest and fair efforts to maintain sound constitutional government and the true principles of American liberty.

As the hour is late, gentlemen, I conclude these remarks with an expression of my thanks to the citizens of Charlotte for the generous hospitality they have extended to those whose presence they have invited.

ARTICLES RELATING TO THE MOUNTAIN REGION OF NORTH CAROLINA.

[Having occasionally, for more than thirty years in the past, written articles in relation to the mountain region of North Carolina, owing to the intervals of time which had elapsed between the successive publications, and also because I had sometimes to reply to similar questions of different persons, there are repetitions in some instances, perhaps, of the statements.

In making the selections which follow, however, I have sought only to present such publications as might convey the leading facts of interest, with as little repetition as possible.]

To J. S. Skinner, Esq.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 3, 1844.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 30th ultimo was received a day or two since, and I now avail myself of the very first opportunity to answer it. I do so most cheerfully, because, in the first place, I am happy to have it in my power to gratify in any manner one who has done so much as yourself to diffuse correct information on subjects most important to the agriculture of the country; and, secondly, because I feel a deep interest in the subject to which your inquiries are directed. You state that you have directed some attention to the sheep husbandry of the United States, in the course of which it has occurred to you that the people of the mountain regions of North Carolina, and some of the other Southern States, have not availed themselves sufficiently of their natural advantages for the production of sheep. Being myself well acquainted with the western section of North Carolina, I may perhaps be able to give you most of the information you desire. As you have directed several of your inquiries to the county of Yancey, (I presume from the fact, well known to you, that it contains the highest mountains in any of the United States,) I will, in the first place, turn my attention to that county. First, as to its elevation. Dr. Mitchell, of our University, ascertained that the bed of Tow river, the largest stream in the county, and at a ford near its centre, was about twenty-two hundred feet above the level of the ocean. Burnsville, the seat of the court-house, he found to be between 2,800 and 2,900 feet above it. The general level of the county is, of course, much above this elevation. In fact, a number of the mountain summits rise above the height of six thousand feet. The climate is delightfully cool during the summer: there being very few places in the county where the thermometer rises above eighty degrees on the hottest day. An intelligent gentleman who passed a summer in the northern part of the county (rather the more elevated portion of it) informed me

that the thermometer did not rise on the hottest days above seventy degrees.

You ask, in the next place, if the surface of the ground is so much covered with rocks as to render it unfit for pasture? The reverse is the fact; no portion of the county that I have passed over is too rocky for cultivation, and in many sections of the county one may travel miles without seeing a single stone. It is only about the tops of the highest mountains that rocky precipices are to be found. A large portion of the surface of the county is a sort of elevated table-land, *undulating*, but seldom too broken for cultivation. Even as one ascends the higher mountains, he will find occasionally on their sides flats of level land containing several hundred acres in a body. The top of the Roan, the highest mountain in the county except the Black, is covered by a prairie for ten miles, which affords a rich pasture during the greater part of the year. The ascent to it is so gradual, that persons ride to the top on horseback from almost any direction. The same may be said of many of the other mountains. The soil of the county generally is uncommonly fertile, producing with tolerable cultivation abundant crops. What seems extraordinary to a stranger is the fact that the soil becomes richer as he ascends the mountains. The sides of the Roan, the Black, the Bald, and others, at an elevation of even five or six thousand feet above the sea, are covered with a rich deep vegetable mould, so soft that a horse in dry weather often sinks to the fetlocks. The fact that the soil is frequently more fertile as one ascends, is, I presume, attributable to the circumstance that the higher portions are more commonly covered with clouds, and the vegetable matter being thus kept in a cool, moist state while decaying, is incorporated to a greater degree with the surface of the earth, just as it is usually found that the north side of a hill is richer than the portion most exposed to the action of the sun's rays. The sides of the mountains, the timber being generally large, with little undergrowth and brushwood, are peculiarly fitted for pasture grounds, and the vegetation is in many places as luxuriant as it is in the rich savanna of the low country.

The soil of every part of the county is not only favorable to the production of grain, but is peculiarly fitted for grasses. Timothy is supposed to make the largest yield, two tons of hay being easily produced on an acre, but herds-grass, or red-top, and clover, succeed equally well; blue-grass has not been much tried, but is said to do remarkably well. A friend showed me several spears, which he informed me were produced in the northern part of the county, and which, by measurement, were found to exceed seventy inches in length; oats, rye, potatoes, turnips, &c., are produced in the greatest abundance.


With respect to the prices of land, I can assure you that large bodies of uncleared rich land, most of which might be cultivated, have been sold at prices varying from twenty-five cents to fifty cents per acre. Any quantity of land favorable for sheep-walks might be procured in any section of the county, at prices varying from one to ten dollars per acre.

The few sheep that exist in the county thrive remarkably well, and are sometimes permitted to run at large during the winter without being fed, and without suffering. As the number kept by any individual is not large enough to justify the employment of a shepherd to take care of them, they are not unfrequently destroyed by vicious dogs, and more rarely by wolves, which have not yet been entirely exterminated.

I have been somewhat prolix in my observations on this county, because some of your inquiries were directed particularly to it, and because most of what I have said about Yancey is true of the other counties west of the Blue Ridge. Haywood has about the same elevation and climate of Yancey. The mountains are rather more steep, and the valleys somewhat broader; the soil generally not quite so deep, but very productive, especially in grasses. In some sections of the county, however, the soil is equal to the best I have seen.

Buncombe and Henderson are rather less elevated; Asheville and Hendersonville, the county towns, being each about twenty-two hundred feet above the sea. The climate is much the same, but a very little warmer. The more broken portions of these counties resemble much the mountainous parts of Yancey and Haywood, but they contain much more level land. Indeed, the greater portion of Henderson is quite level. It contains much swamp land, which, when cleared, with very little if any drainage, produces very fine crops of herdsgrass. Portions of Macon and Cherokee counties are quite as favorable, both as to climate and soil, as those above described. I would advert particularly to the valleys of the Nantahalah, Fairfield, and Hamburg, in Macon, and of Cheoh, in Cherokee. In either of these places, for a comparatively trifling price, some ten or fifteen miles square could be procured, all of which would be rich, and the major part sufficiently level for cultivation, and especially fitted, as their natural meadows indicate, for the production of grass.

In conclusion, I may say that, as far as my limited knowledge of such matters authorizes me to speak, I am satisfied that there is no region that is more favorable to the production of sheep than much of the country I have described. It is everywhere healthy and well watered. I may add, too, that there is water power enough in the different counties composing my Congressional district, to move more machinery than human labor can ever place there; enough, certainly, to move all now existing in the Union. It is also a rich mineral region. The gold mines are worked now to a considerable extent. The best ores of iron are found in great abundance in many places; copper, lead,* and other valuable minerals exist. That must one day become the manufacturing region of the South. I doubt if capital

* Since writing this letter I have discovered there the diamond, platina, blue corundum, in large masses, of brilliant colors, and the most splendid lustre, sapphire, ruby, emerald, euclase, amethyst; also, in various localities, zircon, pyrope, garnet, chromo ore; and manganese, and barytes in large veins; likewise plumbago of the finest quality.  This note was added five years later.

could be used more advantageously in any part of the Union than in that section.

For a number of years past the value of the live stock (as ascertained from books of the Turnpike Company) that is driven through Buncombe county is from two to three millions of dollars. Most of this stock comes from Kentucky and Ohio, and when it has reached Asheville, it has traveled half its journey to the most distant parts of the Southern market, viz: Charleston and Savannah. The citizens of my district, therefore, can get their live stock into the planting States south of us at one-half the expense which those of Kentucky and Ohio are obliged to incur. Not only sheep, but hogs, horses, mules, and horned cattle can be produced in many portions of my district, as cheaply as in those two States.

Slavery is, as you say, a great *bugbear*, perhaps at a distance; but I doubt if any person from the North, who should reside a single year in that country, whatever might be his opinions in relation to the institution itself, would find the slightest injury or inconvenience result to him individually. It is true, however, that the number of slaves in those counties is very small in proportion to the whole population.

I have thus, sir, hastily endeavored to comply with your request, because you state that you would like to have the information at once. Should you find my sketch of the region a very unsatisfactory and imperfect one, I hope you will do me the favor to remember that the desk of a member during a debate is not the most favorable position for writing an essay.

With very great respect, yours,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

J. S. SKINNER, Esq.

To the Editor of the Highland Messenger.

You published a few weeks since an extract from an article in *Siliman's Journal*, contributed by Professor Shepard, in which he described a diamond sent him from this region a few months since. As that extract excited some interest in the minds of a number of my friends who are engaged in the mining business, I inclose you a letter from Professor Shepard, the publication of which I am sure would be acceptable to many of your readers. I may remark in explanation, that, within the last few years I have sent Professor Shepard some hundreds of specimens of minerals collected in this and some of the other western counties of the State. In some instances a doubt as to the character of a particular mineral, induced me to take this course, but more frequently it was done to gratify those of my acquaintances who wished to have their specimens examined by one in whose decision there would be absolute acquiescence. I knew, too, that I should by these means be able favorably to make known to the public the existence in Western North Carolina, of such minerals as might be valuable in a commercial point of view, or interesting to the scientific world. The letter which I send you, was received in reply to an

inquiry directed to Professor Shepard, as to what was his opinion generally in relation to the minerals of this region, and what he thought of the propriety of a more careful survey of it than has hitherto been made. The answer, though merely in reply to my inquiries, is of such a character that I feel quite sure that its publication will be alike creditable to the writer and beneficial to the public. Even should it fail to produce any such impression on the minds of our legislators as might induce them to direct a complete geological survey of the State, its publicity may in other respects prove beneficial.

I have been pleased to observe that the letter of Professor Mitchell, in relation to some of the minerals of this region, which appeared in your paper a year or two since, directed the attention of a number of persons to that subject, and has been the means of bringing under my observation several interesting minerals. By going (whenever leisure has been afforded me) to examine such localities as from their singular appearance or any peculiarity of external character, had aroused the attention of persons in the neighborhood, I have induced many to manifest an interest in such subjects, so that there is in this region a considerable increase in the number of individuals who will lay up and preserve for examination singular looking minerals. Others are deterred from so doing, lest they should be laughed at by their neighbors as unsuccessful *hunters of mines*. Doubtless they deserve ridicule, who, so ignorant of mineralogy as not to be able to distinguish the most valuable metallic ores from the most common and worthless rocks, nevertheless spend their whole time in traveling about the country under the guidance of *mineral rods* or dreams, in search of mines. But almost every one may, without serious loss of time and with trifling inconvenience to himself, preserve for future examination specimens of the different mineral substances he meets with in his rambles. He ought to remember that by so doing he may have it in his power to add to the knowledge, wealth and happiness of his countrymen. Partially separated as this region of country is by its present physical condition from the commercial world, it is of the first consequence to its inhabitants that all its resources should be developed. Opening valuable mines, besides diverting labor now unprofitably, because excessively, applied to agriculture, would attract capital from abroad and furnish a good home market to the farmer.

Should the proposed railroad from Columbia to Greenville, South Carolina, be completed, I am of opinion that the manganese and chrome ores in this and some of the adjoining counties would be profitably exported. Though the veins of sulphate of baryta in the northern part of this county, contain pure white varieties suitable to form an adulterant in the manufacture of the white lead of commerce, yet, for want of a navigable stream, it is not probable they will ever be turned to account in that way. They have, however, at some points, a metallic appearance at the surface, they lie at right angles to the general direction of the veins of the country, go down vertically, and being associated abundantly with several varieties of iron pyrites, oxides of iron, fluor spar and quartz, and containing traces of copper and lead, will doubtless at no very distant day, be explored to a greater or less extent.

There is not a single county west of the Blue Ridge, that does not contain in abundance rich iron ores. In some instances these deposits are adjacent to excellent water power and limestone, and are surrounded by heavily timbered cheap lands. The sparry, carbonate of iron, or *steel ore*, of which a specimen, some years since, fell under the observation of Professor Mitchell, though he was not able to ascertain the locality from which it came, is abundant at a place rather inaccessible in the present condition of the country. It is not probable that in our day the beautiful statuary marble of Cherokee, both white and flesh-colored, will be turned to much account for want of the means of getting it into those markets where it is needed. Besides the minerals referred to in Professor Shepard's letter, some of the ores of copper exist in the western part of this State. I have the carbonate, (green malachite,) the black oxide, and some of the sulphurets. Whether, however, these, as well as the ores of lead and zinc, (both the carbonate and sulphuret exist here,) are in sufficient abundance to be valuable, cannot be ascertained without further examination than has yet been made.

Many persons are deterred from making any search, and are discouraged because valuable ores are not easily discovered on the surface of this country. This is not usually the case any where. Gold, it is true, because it always exists in the metallic state, and because it resists the action of the elements better than any other substance, remains unchanged, while the *gangue*, or mineral containing it crumbles to pieces and disappears, and hence it is easily found about the surface by the most careless observer. Such, however, is not generally the case with metallic ores. On the contrary, many of the best ores would, if exposed to the action of the elements, in progress of time be decomposed, or so changed from the appearances which they usually present when seen in cabinets, that none but a practiced eye would detect them at the surface. In the counties west of the Blue Ridge, there has been as yet no exploration to any depth beneath the surface of the ground, with perhaps the single exception of the old excavations in the county of Cherokee. According to the most commonly received Indian tradition, they were excavated more than a century ago, by a company of Spaniards from Florida. They are said to have worked there for two or three summers, to have obtained a white metal, and prospered greatly in their mining operations, until the Cherokees finding that if it became generally known that there were valuable mines in their country, the cupidity of the white men would expel them from it, determined in solemn council to destroy the whole party, and that in obedience to that decree no one of the adventurous strangers was allowed to return to the country whence they came. Though this story accords very well with the Indian laws which condemned to death those who disclosed the existence of mines to white men, yet I do not regard it as entitled to much credit. At the only one of these localities which I have examined, besides some other favorable indications, there is on the surface of the ground in great abundance that red oxide of iron, which from its being found in Germany above the most abundant deposits of the ores of lead and sil-

ver, has been called by the Germans the *Iron Hat*. Also something resembling that iron ore rich in silver, which the Spaniards called *pacos*, is observable there. It seems more probable, therefore, that some of those companies of enterprising Spaniards, that a century or two since were traversing the continent in search of gold and silver mines, struck by these appearances, sunk the shafts in question and soon abandoned them as unproductive. But which of these is the more probable conjecture, cannot perhaps be determined, until some one shall be found adventurous enough to reopen those old shafts. I am, however, keeping your readers too long from the interesting letter of Professor Shepard.

T. L. CLINGMAN.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Sept. 15, 1846.

HON. MR. CLINGMAN,

Dear Sir:—To your inquiry of what I think of the mineral resources of Western North Carolina, it gives me pleasure to say that no part of the United States has impressed me more favorably than the region referred to. It is proper, however, to state, that my acquaintance with it is not the result of personal observation, but has been formed from a correspondence of several years standing with yourself and Dr. Hardy, and from the inspection of numerous illustrative specimens supplied to me at different times by my colleague, Dr. S. A. Dickson, of Charleston, S. C., and by the students of a medical college of South Carolina, who have long been in the habit of bringing with them to the college samples of the minerals of their respective neighborhoods. I may add to these sources of information, the mention of not unfrequent applications made to me by persons from North Carolina, who have had their attention called to mines and minerals, with a view to their profitable exploration. Nor shall I ever forget the pleasure I experienced a year or two since, on being waited upon in my laboratory by a farmer from Lincolnton, who had under his arm a small trunk of ore in lumps, which he observed that he had selected on account of their size, from the gold washings of his farm during the space of a single year. The trunk contained not far from twelve hundred dollars in value, and one of the specimens weighed two hundred and seventy-five dollars.

I have recognized in the geological formation of the southwestern counties of North Carolina, the same character which distinguishes the gold and diamond region of the Minas Geraes of Brazil, and the gold and platina district, (where diamonds also exist,) of the Urals, in Siberia. It is this circumstance, beyond even the actual discoveries made with us, that satisfies my mind of the richness of the country in the precious metals and the diamond. The beautiful crystal of this gem which you sent me last spring, from a gold washing in Rutherford, however, establishes the perfect identity of our region with the far-famed auriferous and diamond countries of the south and the east.

Neither can there remain any doubt concerning the existence of valuable deposits of manganese, lead, chrome and iron in your immediate vicinity, to which I think we are authorized to add zinc, barytes and marble. I have also seen indications of several of the precious

stones, besides the diamond, making it on the whole a country of the highest mineralogical promise.

Enough has already been developed, as it appears to me, in the minerals of the region under consideration, to arouse the attention of prudent legislators to this fertile source of prosperity in a State. If a competent surveyor of the work were obtained, under whose direction a zealous and well-instructed corps of young men (now easily to be obtained from those States in which such enterprises are just drawing to a close) could take the field, I have no doubt that numerous important discoveries would immediately be made, and that the entire outlay required for carrying forward the work, would in a very short time be many times over returned to the people from mineral wealth, which now lies unobserved in their very midst. But the highest advantages of such a survey would no doubt prove with you as it has done elsewhere, to be *the spirit of inquiry which it would impart to the population generally*, producing among their own ranks an efficient band of native mineralogists and geologists, whose services in their own behalf, in that of their neighbors and the State at large, would, in a few years, greatly outweigh all that had been achieved by the original explorers. It is thus in the States of New England, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Maryland, that there are scattered every where through those communities, numbers of citizens, who having first had their attention called to the subject by the scientific men appointed by the legislature, have now become fully competent to settle most of the questions which arise relating to the values of the unknown mineral substances, which from time to time are submitted by their less informed neighbors for determination. A very observable impulse has in this way been given to the development of underground wealth; and many valuable mines are in the course of active exploration, which but for these surveys and the attendant consequences of them, would now remain not only unproductive but unknown. Nor is the mere mineral yield of these mines to be considered in determining the advantages that accrue to a community from such enterprises. The indirect results to the neighborhood in which the mines are situated, are often very great; such, for example, as those flowing from the increased demand for farming produce, from the free circulation of capital, the improvement of roads, and the general stimulus which is always imparted by successful enterprise to the industry of a country. I may be permitted to add in conclusion also, that an important service is always rendered true science, in restraining the uninformed from unprofitable adventures.

I have a wish to see the public survey of North Carolina undertaken, not only on account of its economical bearings, but from the conviction with which I am impressed, that it will equally promote the progress of science, and elevate the character of our country at large.

I have the honor to remain very truly and obediently yours,

CHARLES UPHAM SHEPARD.

To the North Carolina Land Company.

RALEIGH, N. C., April 7, 1869.

In compliance with your request, I proceed to give you a concise statement in relation to the western part of our State, viz: that elevated table land extending from the Blue Ridge to the Tennessee State line. Almost all of it was embraced in the Congressional district which I represented for more than a dozen years, and even after I became a Senator, I was frequently passing over it. In fact, I have ascended almost all the principal mountains, and, for the purpose of observing the geological and mineralogical features, visited most of its valleys. Its length, extending as it does, from Virginia to Georgia, is not less than two hundred and fifty miles, while its breadth varies from thirty to sixty miles, averaging probably fifty or thereabouts.

It has along its eastern border the Blue Ridge, by which name in North Carolina, is designated the mountain chain that divides the waters falling into the Atlantic from those of the Mississippi valley. Its western boundary is the great ledge of mountains called in different portions of its course, Smoky, Iron, Unaka, &c. Though this range is cut through by the streams running to the west, yet it not only has many points higher than any along the Blue Ridge, but its general elevation and mass are greater. There are also a number of cross chains of mountains, the most elevated of which are the Black and Balsam ranges. There are many points exceeding six thousand feet in altitude above the sea, while the lower valleys or beds of the principal streams in the central parts of the plateau, are from two thousand to twenty-five hundred feet above tide-water. To give one an idea of the general elevation of the surface, it may be stated that nineteen-twentieths of the land will be found between the elevations of eighteen hundred and thirty-five hundred feet above the level of the ocean. It presents therefore, a delightful summer climate, surpassing, I think, that of any part of Switzerland. The range of the thermometer in summer is from twelve to fifteen degrees Fahrenheit, below that of the northern cities, rarely going up to eighty-five degrees in the shade at any hour of the warmest days. The air is almost always bracing and exhilarating in a high degree, while no country is more healthy, being not only free from all miasmatic diseases, but favorable even in winter. Having a southern latitude and surrounded on all sides by lower and warmer regions, its winter climate is much milder than that of northern Virginia or Pennsylvania. It is unusual for the ground to be covered with snow for as much as a week at a time, and the deepest snows commonly disappear in two or three days on all those portions of the ground exposed to the sunshine.

In many instance persons threatened with consumption have found the climate of Buncombe, about Asheville, both in winter and summer, very favorable to them. A gentleman who has passed several winters both at Asheville and in Minnesota, says that the climate of the former place is quite as dry at that of the latter and much milder.

The geological formation belongs chiefly to the older series of rocks, and they are generally well disintegrated. There is one remarkable

exception, however, in a belt of country extending from the Grandfather Mountain southerly, embracing the Linville and Table Mountain ridges. This consists mainly of strata of a more recent origin, quartzite, elastic sandstone, (the Itacolumite or diamond bearing rock of Brazil) and certain slates. The soil over this belt is thin, and covered chiefly with white pine, and such shrubs and plants as are found in poor, silicious soils. Outside of this comparatively small tract, the soil of the mountain region is remarkable for its fertility. The gneiss, mica, slate, syenite, and other honblendic and feruginous rocks are well decomposed and have liberated in great abundance fertilizing ingredients. While no part of the section would be termed rocky in comparison with the New England States, yet there is more rock visible on the eastern border of the belt than on the side next to the State of Tennessee. In general the disintegration seems deeper and the soil richer as one approaches the western border. The Yellow and Roan Mountains in Mitchell, and the great Smoky Mountain in Haywood, Jackson and Macon, furnish striking examples of this fact. On those mountains, at an elevation of six thousand feet, a horse will often sink to his fetlocks in a thick, black, vegetable mould, and the growth, whether timber, grass, or weeds, appears to be as luxuriant as in the swamps of the low country. Even the balsam fir tree, which is usually of no great height, attains an altitude of one hundred and fifty feet on the southern side of the great Smoky, a mountain which from its bulk and general altitude, has been designated by Professor Guyot as "the culminating point of the Alleghanies." The fact that the mountains usually become richer as we ascend them, is doubtless due to the circumstances that being often enveloped by clouds, and kept cool and moist, the vegetable matter slowly decays, and is incorporated with the soil, as usually seen on the north or shady side of a hill.

There is no country of equal extent perhaps better timbered than this. Along some of the streams a good deal of white pine and hemlock are to be found, but the forests chiefly consist of hard wood. All the varieties of the oak are abundant and attain a great size. The white oaks in many places are especially large. So are the chestnut, hickory, maple, poplar, or tulip trees, black walnut, locust, and in fact probably every known tree that grows in the Middle and Northern States of the Union. There are a few treeless tracts on the tops of of several of the higher mountains (covered, however, with luxuriant grasses) which the aboriginal inhabitants regarded as the foot-prints of the evil one, as he stepped from mountain to mountain.

Among the most beautiful valleys are the upper French Broad and Mills River valleys of Henderson and Transylvania. The Swannanoa, in Buncombe, the Pigeon river, Richland, and Jonathan's creek flat lands in Haywood, and those of the Valley river and Hiawasse in Cherokee and portions of the upper Linville in Mitchell.

While all the counties contain large bodies of fertile land, perhaps the soil of Yancey and Mitchell is most generally rich, though the lands are more commonly hilly or rolling than they are in several of

the other counties. For its valleys and its fertile mountains combined, none of the counties perhaps surpass Haywood.

There are few of the lands of this whole region too steep for cultivation. They produce good crops of Indian corn, wheat, oats and rye. In contests for prizes in agricultural fairs in Buncombe, from one hundred to one hundred and fifty bushels of the former grain have been produced. The Irish potato and the turnip will probably do as well as in any country whatever, and no region surpasses it for grasses. Timothy and orchard grass perhaps do best, but clover, red top, and blue grass thrive well. This region seems to surpass all others for the production of the apple, both as to size and flavor. Peach trees do well and bear abundantly of fine sized fruit, but they rather resemble such as are grown in New Jersey for example, and are inferior in flavor to those that are produced on the east of the mountains in this State. The same may be said of melons. The grape is thrifty and grows abundantly. Besides the Catawba, a native of Buncombe, there are many other native varieties, some of which are of good size and delicious flavor. As these different kinds do not ripen simultaneously, it would be easy to make such selections for cultivation as to lengthen the period of vintage and thus increase its product.

All kinds of live stock can be raised with facility. Sheep in flocks of fifty or sixty browse all winter in good conditions. I never saw larger sheep anywhere than some I noticed in Hamburg valley, Jackson county, the owner of which told me that he had not for twelve years past fed his sheep beyond giving them salt to prevent their straying away. He said that he had on his first settling there, tried feeding them in winter, but observed that this made them very lazy, and therefore he had abandoned this practice. The sixty I saw were quite as large as any of the sheep I observed once in Regent's Park, London, which were said to be the property of Prince Albert.

Horses and horned cattle are usually driven out into the mountains about the first of April and are brought back in November. Within six weeks after they have thus been "put into range" they become exceedingly fat and sleek. There are, however, on the tops and along the sides of the higher mountains, evergreen or winter grasses on which the horses and horned cattle live well through the entire winter. Such animals are often foaled and reared there until fit for market, without ever seeing a cultivated plantation.

Very little has yet been done with the minerals of this region. There are narrow belts of limestone and marble which are sufficient for the wants of the inhabitants. Iron ores exist in great abundance in many places. The magnetite is found in quantity at many points, and where it is being worked at Cranberry Forge, in Mitchell, it yields an iron equal to the best Swede. There is in Cherokee county a vein of hematite which runs by the side of a belt of marble for forty miles, and is in many places from fifty to one hundred feet thick. It is easily worked and affords good iron. Copper ores are found in many of the counties, and where the veins have been cut in Jackson county, they are large and very promising. Gold has been profitably mined in Cherokee, Macon and Jackson, and lead, silver and zinc are found at

certain points. After the completion of the railroads now in course of construction, the chrome ores and barytes may acquire value.

No country is better supplied with water power than this. The streams attain a sufficient size in the higher valleys, and before they escape in the State of Tennessee they have a descent of a thousand feet. The French Broad at Asheville is larger than the Merrimac at Lowell, and falls six hundred feet in the distance of thirty odd miles, and will soon have a railroad along its banks. Every neighborhood has its waterfalls sufficient for all practical purposes.

The prices of land throughout this entire section are very moderate compared with those of similar lands in the Northern States, while the population, though sparse, is quiet, orderly and moral. The negroes, not constituting one-tenth of the entire population, are scarcely an appreciable element. Emigrants with little capital can easily obtain the necessaries of life, and may at once commence the business of stock raising, and cheese, butter and wool, and such agricultural productions as will best bear transportation. Manufacturing and mining operations will soon follow these branches of industry. I have no doubt if the people of the Northern States knew this region as I do they would move down in large bodies immediately to take possession of it. The pleasant climate, good soil and beautiful scenery make it one of the most attractive countries in the world. The wealthy citizen will find the greatest inducements to place there his charming villa, while to the industrious it will afford a comfortable home

Very respectfully, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

Extracts from a paper addressed to Wm. Frazier, Esq., President of the American Agricultural and Mineral Land Company, New York, June 12th, 1867.

* * * * *

Mr. William McDowell, who made observations for the Smithsonian Institute, at Asheville, for several years, informed me that the thermometer during the warmest summer weather did not rise above eighty-two degrees Fahrenheit. Even the climate of Switzerland is not equal to that of this region; not only at Geneva, but in the high valley of Chamouny, I once found hotter weather than I ever experienced in this section; while there, one is occasionally chilled in mid-summer by cold blasts from the masses of snow on the higher Alps. In Western North Carolina none of the mountains are high enough to bear snow in summer, yet the region is sufficiently elevated to afford a climate which is cool, dry, bracing and exceedingly exhilarating. No country is more healthy, being alike free from the diseases of miasmatic regions, as well as those common in rigorous or damp climates.

What especially distinguishes this section from all other mountain regions that I have seen, is the general fertility of its soil. This is true not only with reference to its valleys, but also of its mountains. Their sides and even tops are generally covered with a thick vegetable mould, on which the largest trees and grasses grow luxuriantly. At an eleva-

tion of five thousand feet above the ocean, the grasses and weeds are so rank as to remind one of the swampy lands of the lower regions. On the tops, and for a considerable distance down the sides of the higher chains, there are several varieties of evergreen or "winter grasses," as they are generally called there. These are so nutritious that cattle are kept in good condition on them all the winter. A friend of mine, before the war, kept four or five hundred horned cattle on one of these mountains, and with the exception that they were supplied with salt occasionally, they subsisted entirely both in summer and winter on these grasses. The older cattle, he assured me, soon learned to understand the effect of the seasons, and without being driven, they led the herds, in the spring, down the sides of the mountain to obtain the young grasses that come up with the warm weather, and when these were destroyed by the autumn frosts they returned to the tops to get the evergreen vegetation, and found shelter under the spreading branches of the balsam fir trees in stormy weather. I have seen in Haywood county a five year old horse that was said to have been foaled and reared entirely on the top of Balsam Mountain, and was then for the first time brought down to see cultivated land and eat food grown by the hand of man.

Those portions of the mountain that are without timber are, of course, covered by the thickest coats of grass. The balsam trees which cover for so great an extent the Great Smoky, Balsam, and Black Mountains, could be easily gotten rid of at a cost of not more than a couple of dollars per acre. It is so soft as to be easily cut, and if felled and suffered to lie a few months, its leaves would become quite dry, and it might be burned with the greatest facility. When thus destroyed it would not spring up again, but in its stead a very thick sward of evergreen grass. Immense winter pastures could in this way be prepared, and thousands of cattle thus sustained in the winter, with only an occasional supply of salt.

* * * * *

Last summer I went with Mr. N. W. Woodfin over a mountain farm of his, the land of which had originally cost him less than one dollar per acre. It had been cleared by cutting out the undergrowth, and girdling the large timber so as to deaden it, and then put in grass, nearly twenty years previously. It was covered over with a thick growth of timothy and orchard grass, much of which appeared as thick and as tall as a fair wheat field. In some places we found both of these grasses rising high enough, as we sat on our horses, for us to take the top of the stalks growing on each side, and cause them to meet above the withers of our horses. I never, in fact, saw better grass anywhere than grew generally over this entire tract of twelve hundred acres.

Irish potatoes, cabbages and turnips are grown in the greatest quantities, while no country excels this for fruits. Its apples, both in size and flavor, excel those that I have seen in any part of the world; while peaches, pears and grapes grow abundantly. Besides the Catawba, there are a great many other native grapes. One gentleman thinks he has obtained a hundred varieties of native grapes, some of which he considers superior to the Catawba. That this country is admirably adapted to the production of grapes and wine there can be no question. The fact that varieties of grapes can be selected, that ripen at different periods

of the autumn, will make the vintage longer than it is in Europe, and thus increase the amount of wine made. All kinds of live stock thrive in the country, though horses and horned cattle have been more generally raised, because they require less care from the farmer. Sheep are very healthy, and grow well everywhere. As large sheep as I ever saw were some that were suffered to run in the woods, both in summer and winter, without being fed. Mr. Woodfin also stated to me, that he could, from the stock of his farm above alluded to, at all periods of the winter obtain good mutton and beef from the animals that were subsisted on the grass. Even when sheep are to be kept in large numbers, it is certain that they would do with half the feeding they require during the long winters in New England. Snow seldom remains many days at a time, even on the mountain tops in North Carolina; and when the grass is good, little is required in the form of hay or other food for the stock.

* * * * *

T. L. CLINGMAN.

THE CLIMATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND ITS HEALTHFULNESS FOR CONSUMPTIVES AND OTHERS.

[Published in the DAILY NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD, May 25th, 1869.]

To Richard Kingsland, Esq.

RALEIGH, N. C., May 24, 1869.

Dear Sir:—I take pleasure in complying with your request, to state in writing, the substance of my conversation with you on the subject of vegetation in the upper parts of the State. This has been the third of a series of springs remarkable for dampness and coolness. I have noticed them particularly, because it was stated in the newspapers two years ago last winter, that the earthquakes occurring at that time, had by elevating portions of the bed of the ocean, changed the current of the gulf stream, and thrown it much nearer to our coast. I have no means of knowing whether there is in fact a foundation for such a statement, but if it were true, it might be expected to produce some changes of climate. The warm air arising from a body of water of high temperature, saturated with moisture, brought into contact with the colder air of the land winds, would of course on being chilled, let go a portion of its water which would thereupon be condensed into fog or cloud. The moist climate of Ireland and England is attributed to the fact that a large portion of the Northern Atlantic Ocean is covered by water from the Gulf Stream, which has a temperature of ten or twelve degrees higher than the surrounding ocean, and hence the westerly winds carry the air from that region, saturated with moisture, to these countries. Similar results are produced in other localities by ocean currents. If the Gulf Stream is now exerting such an influence on our climate, we must hereafter expect similar weather in the spring to continue until the advance of summer makes the air of the land as warm as the sea, when the precipitation of fog would cease. These three damp, cool springs, however, may be only accidental, but if our

climate is to be permanently changed, it is interesting to examine what is to be the effect on agricultural industry. It is my opinion that the change will be upon the whole beneficial. It is true the cotton has been injured, but if we have late and dry autumns like the two last, late planting might keep up the productions to the former standard. Corn must also be planted a little later, with, however, no bad result. Small grain crops will, I think, be on the whole improved, while grass is unusually fine. When I was at Morganton a few weeks since, my attention was called to a lot of clover of Mr. Walton's, which several gentlemen who had traveled much, thought as fine for that period of the year, as they had ever seen. On going over to Asheville in a few days, however, I saw some of Dr. Hilliard's of Buncombe, which notwithstanding the late season, was much finer. I also observed on some ground of Mr. Winslow Smith, most remarkable orchard grass, so luxuriant and rank that an English gentleman with me, who had been a great traveler, at first doubted that it was really orchard grass. All the grounds of that region, and in fact of the upper portion of the State, show unusually good grasses. Should our climate become moist and cool like that of England, why should we not have as fine grain and grasses? If these springs are to be the rule I am satisfied that the State will, as a whole, be much benefitted even though less cotton be made.

It may not be out of place for me to say something of the new grass called Japan clover, which is seen in a few places west of the Blue Ridge, but which seems to be rapidly covering the counties on this side of it to the extent of more than a hundred miles. None of the causes hitherto assigned for the rapid spread of this grass are sufficient to account for or explain the facts, and its progress appears miraculous. It does not seem to interfere with the fields in active cultivation, nor even to penetrate much into the oak forests, but it seizes with avidity upon old fields, whether covered by pines or broom-sedge grass. It manifests an especial hostility to the last named plant, slaughtering it without mercy, and ultimately exterminating it as an useless "cumberer of the ground." It spreads under the pines a beautiful emerald green carpet, thick and elastic. It also takes possession of gullies and all abandoned portions of the roads, and will probably take hold of embankments and sides of cuts of railroads, so as to render unnecessary turfing them in the manner in which it is done in England. Hogs, sheep, horned cattle and horses all seem to devour it greedily, and appear to thrive on it. Should it furnish a good pasture for seven or eight months in the year to such stock, great benefit will be the result. Covering the ground so densely and shading it effectually, it will soon improve the abandoned lands.

I was at the North a few weeks ago, and from what I saw and have since learned, measured by the vegetation in the western part of this State, the spring is two months earlier than it is in New York and New England. Every one must see what advantage this gives our agriculture.

There is another subject directly connected with the industry of the country of great importance, however, on which I wish to say some-

thing to you. Thousands of persons annually die of consumption and other lung diseases in the Northern States. For persons afflicted with these diseases the cold climate of Minnesota has been recommended because of its dryness, and so also has Aiken and other localities in the South. Some publications have recently been made by scientific and professional gentlemen, showing that the climate of portions of the mountain region of this State are equal to Minnesota in dryness, and superior in equability and mildness of temperature, and that the greater elevation, dryness and cooler summer weather, make it better for such invalids than Aiken, for example, elevation being one of the most important elements. The observations made for the use of the Smithsonian Institute, at Asheville, have been carefully examined, and it has been shown that the place has a climate almost identical with that of Milan, in Italy, and Vienne, in France, both of which are the resorts of invalids. In none of these publications, however, is there an explanation of the physical causes which have produced there a climate not only cool in the summer, but uncommonly dry and bracing. Unless these facts are understood, persons may be misled in selecting the best place for health. Though all the mountain region of this State is quite salubrious, it would be a great mistake to suppose that all of it, or the plateau of the Cumberland Mountain, in Tennessee, had a climate as dry as that of Asheville. The belt of country which has the driest climate, does not in fact constitute more than one-fourth, or even so much of one mountain region.

When, many years ago, I became a resident of Asheville, I was struck by the singular appearances there observed. In winter, with winds from the northeast, we often had for days light, broken bunches of clouds floating along the heavens, with sky more or less constantly visible, while to the east there appeared heavy masses, and even a few miles to the west the quantity of cloud was much greater than over the immediate region where I stood. A little snow fell, but not enough to cover the ground; and yet, when I went twenty miles to the east into McDowell county, I often found three or four inches of snow, and the like frequently in Haywood county, on the west. Similar facts were manifested in the summer, viz: weather somewhat cloudy, with little rain at Asheville; more, however, a few miles west, and considerable rains on the east side of the Blue Ridge, in McDowell. I began to examine the configuration of the mountain chains, and soon satisfied myself that I understood the cause of these phenomena.

It is known that a current of air, saturated with moisture, in rising to pass over a mountain, is rarified, cooled, and will let go a portion of its moisture, which is thereupon condensed into minute drops of water, making fog or cloud. One often sees, for hours in succession, a small patch of cloud hovering about the top of a mountain, even when a strong gale of wind is blowing, and some persons wonder why the wind does not carry off this little mass of white cloud, making a mistake unlike that of a person, who, observing the cataract of Niagara from a distance, should take it to be a column of water standing still all day. As soon as this cloud is carried down into a warmer

region, it at once disappears by being reconverted into invisible vapor, the air ceasing to precipitate moisture, and becoming one of evaporation again, or a drying air. This is illustrated on a large scale near the Rocky Mountains, on the western slopes of which the winds from the Pacific ocean deposit their moisture, while on the east there is so little rain that extensive deserts exist. The country around Asheville is under the influence of similar causes, but not to an extent sufficient to make a desert or even perceptibly to diminish vegetation. It is merely somewhat drier than the surrounding regions.

This condition results from such a configuration of the country as will be apparent to any one who examines it carefully. There is a belt of table land, about the centre of which is at Asheville, extending for nearly seventy miles in a northwestwardly and southeasterly direction, but somewhat nearer to the northern and southern points than to the eastern and western. It is fifteen miles in breadth, perhaps twenty at some points, and has an average elevation of twenty-two or three hundred feet above the sea. Though it seems broken to one traveling over it, yet when one ascends an eminence he sees what appears to be a level plateau of which Henderson county embraces the southern, and Buncombe the centre and Madison the northern portion. Only, however, the central parts of these counties lie within the belt. The French Broad river in Henderson is but little below the adjoining hills. At Asheville it has sunk two hundred and fifty feet, and in the northern portions of Madison it has cut a channel eight or nine hundred feet deep, below the hills, half a mile distant from it. There is no cross mountain chain or any considerable obstruction across this long plateau. Hence the winds from the west and northwest, these being the prevailing winds throughout the year, move unobstructed along this belt with a rapid current and a dry and exhilarating air. In fact, where the course of a current of air comes near the direction of this belt, it seems drawn into and accelerated like the waters of a river along a narrow pass. About Asheville, therefore, it is never sultry except for a short period, sometimes before a thunder shower.

Most of the rains, however, of the western part of this State, are brought by winds from the east and from the southwest. Fifteen miles to the east and to the southeast of Asheville, extends the Blue Ridge Mountain, with an average elevation of fifteen hundred feet, probably, above it. The easterly and southeasterly winds precipitate a portion of their moisture on the eastern slopes of this mountain, and after passing it and descending to a lower attitude, they become comparatively dryer, and often cease to drop rain at all. The most disagreeable weather that visits the Atlantic States, however, is that accompanied by the northeasterly winds. Against them there is a still greater barrier afforded by Craggy, the Black Mountain, and a third ridge running to the north, the highest position of which is called Yeates' Knob. This mass of mountains lying on the northeast of Asheville, and attaining an elevation of more than six thousand feet above the sea, or four thousand feet above the table land, presents a barrier against the northeastern storms, so formidable that the clouds are broken to pieces and fall over it in scattered fragments.

The southwesterly winds, however, bring much rain, often continuing for days at a time. Against them, however, nature has furnished a protection. From the Great Smoky Mountain, at a point a little to the north of west from Asheville, the Balsam Mountain, the longest of the cross chains, extends itself entirely over the State to the borders of South Carolina. It attains a general height of at least six thousand feet, and with its spurs extending somewhat towards Asheville, the Cold Mountain and Pisgah ridges, for a hundred degrees in distance, it breaks the force of the southwestern winds. It thus happens that most of the rain-bearing winds, before reaching this region, have, by passing over higher lands, lost a portion of their moisture, and the atmosphere, therefore, of the tract, is comparatively a dry one.

The Greenbrier White Sulphur Springs, in Virginia, are only five hundred feet lower than Asheville, and yet, from its surroundings, it is not only often damper, but also much hotter. At Burnsville, in Yancey county, forty miles north of Asheville, and six hundred feet higher, and in winter much colder, I have seen it in like manner warmer in summer, because surrounded by mountains, which obstruct the currents of air. I also, once in the Alps, while crossing a ridge of several thousand feet elevation, because enclosed by high mountains, found very sultry weather.

I do not mean to have it understood that we have not at Asheville often disagreeable periods, but merely to state that there is less bad weather at that point than I have observed at other places with which I am acquainted. I think that a large percentage of people who annually die of lung diseases in the North-eastern States might attain the average longevity if they were to remove to this region. Persons threatened with consumption, whose means permit, might derive quite as much advantage from visiting that locality as the Southern planters who have been accustomed to travel to the Virginia Springs, to Saratoga and to Newport.

By calling their attention to this subject you may, sir, render essential service to the cause of humanity.

Respectfully yours,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

To MR. R. KINGSLAND.

OLD DIGGINGS FOR MICA IN WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA.

ASHEVILLE, April 8, 1873.

MESSRS. CARTER & AVERY,

Gentlemen: In reply to your inquiries with reference to the mica deposits in this section of the State, and the appearance of early operation for the same, I can now, before leaving town, only present you a brief statement.

The old Cherokee Indians, living in some of the western counties, used to speak of a tradition coming down in their tribe, that long ago companies of white men came on mules from the south, worked during the summer, and carried off a white metal with them. The remains

of some old works in Cherokee county seem to give countenance to this report, and, at one place at least, present the appearance of having been excavated by persons skilled in mining. The fact that they were abandoned before much work was done, would rather imply that they were mere tests, which had proved unsuccessful.

There are, however, in other localities, numerous remains of old excavations, some of which are much more extensive, and which were done in a different formation. In the year 1867, and in the early part of 1868, I examined several of these localities in the counties of Cleveland, Rutherford and Burke, on the east side of the Blue Ridge, and in Mitchell, Yancey and Buncombe. In most instances the work had been slight, showing that it had been done as a mere experiment, which had not proven satisfactory. In several localities, however, it was very manifest that the operators had met with such success as to cause them to extend their working generally. In every case I examined, the outcrop of the veins was so similar as to leave no doubt but that the parties had found at certain localities some mineral of value to them, and that wherever they had observed like indications they had made tests. Again, from the fact that they never worked in hard ground—that is, where the work required blasting—it was evident that they were not provided with the means of blasting.

At every one of the places I examined, mica was abundant in veins composed chiefly of felspar and quartz, the former generally predominating. The mica left among the debris was generally in small flakes, except at Mr. Garrett Ray's, on the waters of Bolin's creek, where a number of large sheets had been left. This last mentioned fact seemed to indicate that the mica itself had not been the object of the exploration.

The most extensive of all the excavations was that on the land of Mr. Wm. Slivers, in Mitchell county, near the road from Burnsville to Bakersville. From the appearances there, it would seem that a large number of miners had been at work for years at that place. In the excavations, extending for about four hundred yards, they had at intervals left bars across as if to prevent the earth at the sides from falling in—making thus a succession of openings fifty or sixty feet in extent, separated by narrow ridges of earth. Timber which I examined that had grown on the earth thrown out, had been growing as long as three hundred years. Near one of the workings, not far from this place, I also saw a slab of stone that had evidently been marked by blows of a metallic tool, and which had, from the appearance about it, been most probably intended to mark the locality.

As the manner in which the work had been done at Mr. Sliver's resembled that sometimes practiced by the Mexicans, it seemed possible that a party of Spaniards—about the time when Cortes was in Mexico and De Soto was in Florida—might have rambled up into this region and, by employing the Indians as laborers, in the course of a few years have caused such explorations to have been made. On examining the material about the place, I found fragments that had been thrown out very like in their appearance some of the best Mexican silver ores. Several western miners, to whom the specimens were

shown in New York, prior to an assay, expressed great confidence that they would go to two or three hundred dollars in silver per ton. An assay, however, seemed to show only three dollars per ton. I caused it to be repeated, and had the same reply. This would seem to indicate that these were bits discarded because too poor, but that the work had perhaps been prosecuted for silver. I caused, therefore, a shaft to be sunk, and two tunnels to be carried entirely below the old excavations, and became satisfied that there was no workable silver ore to be found there. Large mica of good quality was abundant. It seemed certain that this work had all been done for mica. But the question more difficult to answer, presented itself; by whom could this work have been executed? The Norsemen were on our coast as far back as six or seven centuries ago; they might have penetrated into the interior, and by employing the natives have caused these works to be executed, and carried the mica away to be used as window-lights for their huts, as the inhabitants of the Arctic regions are said sometimes to do. But on the other hand I have been informed that mica has been found with other Indian ornaments and implements in certain caves in Tennessee, and perhaps elsewhere. It does not, therefore, seem improbable that a former race of Indians—possibly the “Mound-builder,” who used copper tools—made these excavations for the purpose of procuring the mica.

These veins are found in the gneiss and mica slate strata, which constitute the greater portion of the rocks of this region. The elements of their composition are identical with those of these strata, and even of clay slate. The difference is wholly in the structure of the veins, and not in their elements. In the veins the felspar, which usually predominates, exists tolerably pure, the quartz in lumps or large masses, and the mica in crystals of various sizes, sometimes weighing several hundred pounds. Near the surface the felspar, converted by atmospheric action into kaolin, presents chalky looking belts, with quartz lying in lumps of different sizes, and more or less mica scattered around.

As almost all the rocky strata of this and the adjoining counties consist in great part of mica, persons must expect to find it everywhere. For commercial purposes, it is to be sought therefore where it exists in places of some size, is sufficiently transparent, and is free from such contortions and flaws as prevent its being split into thin sheets. Though the sizes of the crystals will vary in different parts of the vein, they are likely to be as large at the surface as deeper down. That found at the surface, however, is usually injured by exposure to the weather, which in time, decomposes it, and is also disfigured by the clay carried into its seams. Unless within a few feet of the surface some mica of fair size is found, there would not seem to be encouragement to expend much labor in explorations.

Besides the valuable mines now being operated on in the counties of Mitchell and Yancey, I have seen from two localities in the southern part of this county, Buncombe, mica of fine size and good quality. Such is also found in the counties of Haywood, Jackson and Macon to the west, and as far east as Lincoln and Catawba. There seems to be

no doubt but that there is a tract of country of more than one hundred and fifty miles in extent capable of producing good mica, in quantities sufficient to supply a very large demand. Should that demand continue, these mines might be worked profitably to the depth of a thousand feet or more, and for centuries to come.

No other mineral of much commercial value has yet been found in the mica veins, but it is to be hoped that at some point or other the beryls found may occur in the form of emeralds. I have seen two or three transparent white beryls, and several small aquamarines, some of which I had cut. This last mineral, though used as a gem, is, in fact, worth little more than the cost of cutting it. As however the emerald owes its fine green color to the presence of less than one per cent. of the oxyd of chromium, and as chrome ore is widely dispersed throughout this section, we may hope that at some point emeralds may be found. I need scarcely remind you that the emerald ranks next in value to the ruby and the diamond.

Very respectfully yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

MOUNT PISGAH, NORTH CAROLINA.

By Hon. T. L. CLINGMAN.

[FROM APPLETON'S JOURNAL, December 27, 1873.]

Many of our readers have learned, from the careful measurements of Professor Arnold Guyot, of Princeton—prosecuted as they were through three summers—that there are in North Carolina about thirty designated mountain-peaks that surpass in altitude Mount Washington, of New Hampshire. The elevated area of North Carolina is more than two hundred miles in length, by an average breadth of fifty miles. Its eastern boundary is the Blue Ridge, which separates the waters of the Atlantic from those falling into the Mississippi. It attains its greatest elevation at the Grandfather Mountain. The western boundary of this plateau is the great Alleghany chain, which, though cut by the rivers through several passes, has a greater general elevation, and many higher peaks, than any in the Blue Ridge.

Through North Carolina this range is known in its course by the several names of Roan, Unaka, Iron and Smoky. The last name indicates that portion which, from its extent, large mass, great altitude, and the number and height of the ridges connected with it, has been pronounced by Professor Guyot the culminating point of the Alleghanies. Its highest peak, as measured and named by him, appears on the maps of the Coast Survey as Clingman's Dome.

Besides these great ranges, there are a number of cross-chains, the most prominent of which are the Black and the Balsam. The last of these, from its extent, and general altitude, and the great number of its peaks, surpassed only by those of the Black and Smoky, is the most important of all the cross-chains. It extends from the Smoky, across

the State, to the border of South Carolina, and, for the distance of nearly fifty miles it is covered by the Balsam trees, from which it takes its name.

On some of the old maps, at a point in its course, one may see marked "Devil's Old Field." This spot must not be confounded with the "Devil's Supreme Court-House," in which the devil, according to Cherokee lore, was to try all mankind at the last day. This Devil's Court-House, situated twenty miles west, on the border of Jackson and Macon counties, is an immense precipice, nearly a mile long, and eighteen hundred feet high, being so curved as to form a part of the arc of a circle. When one in front looks at its concave surface, he sees, half-way up, an immense opening, which constitutes the throne of the author of evil, where bad spirits are to hear their doom.

But the Devil's Old Field is an opening of several hundred acres on the top of the Balsam range. The Cherokees regard the treeless tracts, at various points on the mountains, as the footprints of Satan, as he stepped from mountain to mountain. This old field, however, being his favorite resting-place, was more extensive than were his mere footprints. In fact, this was his chosen sleeping-place. Once, on a hot summer day, a party of irreverent Indians, rambling through the dense forests of balsam and rhododendrons, suddenly came into the edge of the open ground, and with their unseemly chattering, woke his majesty from his *siesta*. Being irritated, as people often are when disturbed before their nap is out, he suddenly, in the form of an immense serpent, swallowed fifty of them before they could get back into the thicket. Ever after this sad occurrence, the Cherokees, as the sailors say, gave this locality "a wide berth."

After the whites got into the country, a set of hunters, known by the name of Q—, either by daring or diplomacy got on better terms with the old fellow. As their reputation was anything but good, envious people used to say that they escaped injury at the hands of Satan upon the same principle that prevents a sow from eating her own pigs. These Q—'s spoke in favorable terms of the personal cleanliness of his majesty, and his regard for comfort, asserting that they had gone to the large, overhanging rock, in the centre of the field where he slept, and, out of mischief, in the evening had thrown rocks and brushwood on his bed, and that next morning the place was invariably as clean as if it had been brushed with a bunch of feathers. Of late years no one has seen him in those parts, and it is believed that, either tired of the loneliness of the place, or because he could do better elsewhere, he has emigrated.

Near the southern end of the Balsam Mountain, two spurs leave it on the east side and run out for a dozen miles toward the north. As one goes along the most westerly of the two, he comes to the Shining Rock, an immense mass of quartz so white as to resemble loaf-sugar. Though the lightning for thousands of years has with furious anger launched its bolts against it, the mass, standing like an immense edifice of snowy marble, glitters in the distance, and is not unaptly termed the Shining Rock. A few miles further along, the ridge rises into an angular eminence more than six thousand feet high, known as the Cold Mountain. The name was applied on account of this occurrence: Several hunters were on the top of the mountain when it was covered by a thick sleet. The heels of one of them, to use a skater's phrase, "flew up,"

causing him to sit down very suddenly. Instead, however, of his remaining quietly thus at rest, the merciless action of the force of gravity, conspiring with the inclination of the ground, caused him to slide rapidly for a couple of hundred yards down the mountain-side. When finally he did bring up in a bank of snow, he was decidedly of opinion that this mountain was the coldest one he had ever seen. In fact, when afterwards questioned if he was not very cold, he said: "Yes, as cold as Cicero in his coldest moment!" He had doubtless heard some local orator pronounced "as eloquent as Cicero," and thus concluded that the old Roman was a man of superlatives generally. Since that day the peak has rejoiced in the name of Cold Mountain.

The twin-ridge, which, leaving the Balsam near the same locality, gradually diverges to the east, terminates in the beautiful peak Mount Pisgah, of which a view is given. Its top, five thousand seven hundred and fifty-seven feet above the sea, is a triangular shaped pyramid. Standing alone as it does, it affords a magnificent view for a hundred miles around. It forms the corner of the four counties of Buncombe, Henderson, Transylvania, and Haywood.

The view presented is from the valley of Homöny creek, at a point a little to the east of north from the mountain. From whatever direction it is seen, its outline is not less pointed than it is in this picture, and is always a striking object before the eye of the spectator. Though one must travel twenty-two miles from Asheville to reach its summit, its distance in a direct line is under fifteen. Its beautiful blue on a summer evening is sometimes changed into a rich purple by the rays of a red cloud thrown over it at sunset. In winter it is even a still more striking object. Covered by a fresh snow in the morning, its various ridges present their outlines so sharply, that it seems as if they had been carved by a chisel into innumerable depressions and elevations. After one or two day's sunshine, the snow disappears on the ridges, but remains in the valleys. The mountain then seems covered from summit to base with alternate bands of virgin white, and a blue more intense and beautiful than the immortal sky itself presents.

While there are many views to be seen from Asheville and its vicinity that from McDowell's Hill, two miles south, is the best. When there, one sees in the west Pisgah, the Cold Mountain, and some of the highest peaks of the Balsam, with many intervening ranges; while to the northeast rises the great mass of Craggy, with its numerous spurs crowned by its pyramid and dome, and the southern point of the Black in the distance. The beautiful Swannanoa makes a handsome curve as it passes through the green carpet two hundred feet below, to unite with the French Broad, which seems to come afar from the base of Pisgah. One who has not been there, has yet to see the finest scene in North Carolina, probably not equaled by any east of the Mississippi.

MOUNTAIN SCENERY.

Extract from a letter written in 1855, to Professor Joseph Henry, of the Smithsonian Institution.

* * * * *

From the head of the Swannanoa, at Mr. Stepps', where an angler can find speckled trout, there is an easy way to the Mountain House, built by William Patton, of Charleston, South Carolina. Its present occupant will provide one with pleasant lodgings, and, what mountain journeys render so welcome, all such comforts "for the inner man," as this region affords, with fresh salmon from Scotland, and champagne from France, to make them go down easily. After resting here awhile, at the height of five thousand four hundred and sixty (5,460) feet above the sea-level, two miles of travel on horseback, as hundreds of ladies can testify, will bring him to the top of Mount Mitchell.

When one is upon this peak, he appears to be on a centre, from which there run off five immense mountain chains. To the northward stretches the main ledge of the Black, with a succession of cones and spires along its dark crest. On its right, from the far northeast, from the Keystone State, across the entire breadth of Virginia, seemingly from an immeasurable distance, comes the long line of the Blue Ridge or Alleghany; but when it passes almost under him, it is comparatively so much depressed as scarcely to be perceptible, save where at the point of junction, stimulated by the presence of its gigantic neighbor, it shoots up into a pinnacle so steep, that, to use a hunter's phrase, it would "make a buzzard's head swim, if he were to attempt to fly over it." Thence it runs southerly, till it touches South Carolina, when it trends to the west, and is soon hidden behind colossal masses that obstruct further vision in that direction. As the chain of the Black sweeps around westwardly, it is soon parted into two immense branches, which run off in opposite courses. The northern terminates in a majestic pile, with a crown-like summit, and numerous spurs from its base; while to the south there leads off the long ridge of Craggy, with its myriads of gorgeous flowers, its naked slopes and fantastic peaks, over which dominates its great dome, challenging in its altitude ambitious comparison with the Black itself.

Let the observer then lift his eye to a remote distance, and take a circuit in the opposite direction. Looking to the southeast and to the east, he sees beyond King's Mountain, and others less known to fame, the plain of the two Carolinas stretched out over an illimitable space, in color and outline indistinguishable from the "azure brow" of the calm ocean. Nearer to him, to the northeast, over the Linville Mountain, stands squarely upright the Table Rock, with its perpendicular faces; and its twin brother, the "Hawk-bill," with its curved beak of overhanging rock, and neck inclined, as if in act to stoop down on the plain below. Further on, there rises in solitary grandeur the rocky throne of the abrupt and wild Grandfather. This "ancient of days" was long deemed the "monarch of mountains," but now, like other royal exiles, he only

retains a shadow of his former authority in a patriarchal name, given because of the grey beard he shows when a frozen cloud has iced his rhododendrons. Westward of him stands a victorious rival, the gently undulating prairie of the Roan, stretching out for many a mile in length, until its green and flowery carpet is terminated by a castellated crag—the Bluff.

From this extends southerly the long but broken line of the Unaka, through the passes of which, far away over the entire valley of East Tennessee, is seen in the distance the blue outline of the Cumberland Mountains, as they penetrate the State of the “dark and bloody ground.” In contrast with the bold aspect and rugged chasms of the Unaka, stands the stately figure of the Bald Mountain, its smoothly-shaven and regularly rounded top bringing to mind some classic cupola; for when the sunlight sleeps upon its convex head, it seems a temple more worthy of all the gods than that Pantheon, its famed Roman rival. As the eye again sweeps onward, it is arrested by the massive pile of the great Smoky Mountain, darkened by its fir trees, and often by the cloudy drapery it wears. From thence there stretches quite through Haywood and Henderson to South Carolina’s border, the long range of the Balsam Mountain, its pointed steeples over-topping the Cold Mountain and Pisgah, and attaining probably their greatest elevation towards the head of the French Broad river.

Besides these, the eye rests on many a “ripe green valley,” with its winding streams, and on many a nameless peak, like pyramid or tower, and many a waving ridge, imitating in its curling shapes the billows of the ocean when most lashed by the tempest. And if one is favored by Jove, he may perchance hear the sharp, shrill scream of his “cloud-cleaving minister,” and, as he sweeps by with that bright eye which “pierces downward, onward or above, with a pervading vision,” or encircles him in wide curves, shows reflected back from the golden brown of his long wings,

“The westering beams aslant”

of the descending sun.

But from Mount Mitchell, where one is still tempted to linger, since my first visit a way has been opened quite to the highest point. As one rides along the undulating crest of the ridge, he has presented to him a succession of varied, picturesque, and beautiful views. Sometimes he passes through open spots, smooth and green enough to be the dancing grounds of the fairies, and anon he plunges into dense forests of balsam, over grounds covered by thick beds of moss, so soft and elastic that a wearied man reposes on it as he would on a basin of fluid mercury. In the last and largest of the little prairies, one will be apt to pause awhile, not only for the sake of the magnificent panorama in the distance, but also because attracted by the gentle beauty of the spot, its grassy, waving surface, interspersed with flattened rocky seats, studded in the sunlight with glittering scales of mica, and here and there clusters of young balsams flourishing in their freshest and richest green, in this, their favorite climate, pointed at top, but spreading below evenly till their lower branches touch the earth, and presenting the outlines of regular cones.

From this place the highest peak is soon attained. Any one who doubts its altitude may thus easily satisfy himself, for it stands, and will continue to stand, courting measurement. One who, from the eminence, looks down on its vast proportions, its broad base and long spurs running out for miles in all directions, and gazes in silent wonder on its dark plumage of countless firs, will feel no fear that its "shadow will ever become less," or that in the present geological age it will meet the fate fancied by the poet, when he wrote the words:

"Winds under ground, or waters forcing way,
Sidelong had pushed a mountain from his seat,
Half sunk with all his pines."

I fear, my dear sir, that I have made this letter much too long for your patience, and yet the vegetation and surrounding scenery of this mountain, peculiar and remarkable as it is, might well tempt me to say many things that I have omitted. I hope your interest in all that relates to natural science will find an apology for my having trespassed on your valuable time. I am very truly yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

[Inquiries are often made as to the heights of various mountains and localities in the western part of North Carolina. To meet such I append a letter of Professor Arnold Guyot. He, during three summers, continued his examination in that section of the State. After his third and last exploration he addressed a letter to the editor of the *Asheville News*, which was published in its issue of July 18, 1860.]

GUYOT'S MEASUREMENT OF THE MOUNTAINS OF WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ASHEVILLE NEWS:

For the last ten years I have devoted the greater portion of my summer excursions to the study of the geography of the Alleghany system, and to the measurement of the height of its mountains. After having ascertained the elevation of the most remarkable peaks of the White and Green Mountains of New England, and of the mountainous tract of the Adirondack in the State of New York, my attention was turned toward the beautiful mountain region of North Carolina, which was said to possess the most elevated peaks of the whole Appalachian range.

It is well known, however, to most of your readers, that when I began my investigations in the Black Mountain in July, 1856, accompanied by my friends, Rev. Dr. H. Green and Mr. E. Sandoz, no other measurements had been attempted in that region, or at least published, as far as I could learn, than those of the noble scientific pioneer in that field, the lamented Dr. E. Mitchell, of Chapel Hill University, and a partial measurement by Hon. T. L. Clingman, to whom also we are indebted for the first clear, accurate, and most graphic description of the Black Mountain. But the statements that Dr. Mitchell made, at different times, of the results of his measurement failed to agree with each other, and owing to unfavorable circumstances and the want of proper

instruments, the precise location of the points measured, especially of the highest, had remained quite indefinite, even in the mind of Dr. Mitchell himself, as I learned it from his own mouth in 1856. I was, therefore, the more anxious to solve these questions by making, first of all, a thorough examination of the Black Mountain. I did so. In my first visit in July, 1856, I had the pleasure of having Dr. Mitchell's company for two days, during that visit, and the second in 1858, which lasted one month each. I measured all the peaks of the Black Mountain; including the Roan and Grandfather Mountains. In a third, in 1859, I ran once more over the whole chain of the Black Mountain to the north end. These several measurements of different years agree so closely with each other, that I feel a considerable degree of confidence in their accuracy. I was confirmed in this belief by the result of a series of levels, carried by Major J. C. Turner from the same point on the Swannanoa river from which I started myself to the highest point on the Black Mountain. Major Turner, who had my own figures in his hands, passed through four of my points, and found them to agree with his own elevations within one or two feet, and the highest about within a yard. So close an agreement by two different methods, and on so great an elevation, is seldom expected.

My measurements have been made with excellent barometers, by Ernst, in Paris, and often and carefully compared with each other. The position of the points measured, has been determined and mapped down, by means of observations with the sextant and a small theodolite. The corresponding observations have been made by my young friends, Mr. E. Sandoz, in 1856, and M. E. Grand Pierre, in 1858 and 1859, both faithful and well practiced observers.

In my excursion last year, 1859, after having re-examined the Black Mountain, I devoted several weeks more to the measurement of the mountains in Haywood and Jackson counties, especially the various Balsam ranges and the great Smoky Mountains.

Though, when studying a group of mountains, my attention is far from being confined to the measurement of the elevation of the highest points, which is a fact of less importance than the physical structure, the proportion of all parts and the relative situation of the various chains composing it, being aware of the interest which was felt among the people of the mountain region in knowing the comparative elevation of the Black Mountain and the great Smoky range, I devoted a special care to that object. By a series of simultaneous observations for two days, taken every half hour at Asheville and at Waynesville, at the residence of Mr. J. R. Love and Colonel R. Love, whose guest I had then the pleasure to be, was found to be situated four hundred and sixty-six feet above Asheville court-house square; and assuming as I do, this last point to be twenty-two hundred and fifty feet, and not twenty-two hundred and sixty feet above the level of the sea, Colonel R. G. A. Love's house becomes twenty-seven hundred and sixteen feet above tide-water. By leveling, I found Waynesville at Welch's Hotel, and court-house sidewalk to be forty feet higher, viz: twenty-seven hundred and fifty-six feet above tide. By another series of two days of hourly observations, the house of Robert Collins, Esq., at the foot of the great Smoky Mountain, was found to be exactly

twenty-five hundred feet above tide. From this last point the highest peak distant about seven miles, was measured repeatedly in five different days, at all hours of the day. On my first visit to it, I encamped on its summit for twenty-six consecutive hours, the barometer being observed every half hour there and below at Mr. Collins' house, excepting from 9 P. M. to 6 A. M. The result was an altitude of sixty-six hundred and sixty feet above the level of the sea.

This height is considerably less than that found in 1858, by the observations of Hon. Thomas L. Clingman, Mr. Buckley and Professor Lecompt.

The difference, however, does not arise from any error of observation, or calculation in that measurement. It will be observed that a great portion of it is due to the difference in the elevation of Waynesville, where one of the barometers was observed, assumed by the gentlemen just mentioned; the rest is owing to the influence of the heat of mid-day, during which the observations were made, an influence which is considerable in fair weather, and which needs to be counteracted by morning and evening observations, in order to get the true height. It is to avoid these disturbing influences that, in the Smoky range, as well as in the Black Mountain, I spent one night, at least, on every one of the principal peaks, the height of which I wished to determine with a particular care.

I must be allowed to add a few words on the names used in the following list of heights. I have preserved for the peaks in the Black Mountain the names that I gave them in my first report on my measurements, made at the Albany meeting of the American Association for the advancement of Science, in August, 1856, before I was aware of any other name having been attached to these particular points. As a matter of course, it is for the people of the surrounding country to choose the one that they prefer. That one the geographer will adopt. What ought to be avoided by all means, in the interest of science and of all, is confusion. Only I may, perhaps, be permitted to express it as my candid opinion (without wishing in the least to revive a controversy happily terminated) that if the honored name of Dr. Mitchell is taken from Mount Mitchell and transferred to the highest peak, it should not be on the ground that he first made known its true elevation, which he never did, nor himself ever claimed to have done; for the true height was not known before my measurement of 1856, and the coincidence made out quite recently may be shown from abundant proofs, furnished by himself, to be a mere accident. Nor should it be on the ground of his having first visited it, for, though after his death evidence, which made it probable that he did, he never could convince himself of it. Nor at last should it be because that peak was, as it is alleged, thus named long before, for I must declare, that neither in 1856, nor later, during the whole time I was on both sides of the mountain, did I hear of another Mount Mitchell than the one south of the highest, so long visited under that name, and that Dr. Mitchell, himself, before ascending the Northern Peak, in 1856, as I gathered it from a conversation with him, believed to be the highest. Dr. Mitchell has higher and better claims, which are universally and cheerfully acknowledged by all to be thus forever remembered in connection with the Black Mountain.

He was the first daring pioneer who made that imperviable wilderness known to the scientific world, and proved the superior height of these mountain peaks above those of the Northern mountains, so long cited as culminating points of the Alleghany system.

From these facts it is evident that the honorable Senator, to whom we are indebted for the first accurate knowledge of the geographical structure of that remarkable group, and whose name stands in the State map on the highest peak, could not possibly know when he first ascended it, that any one had visited or measured it before him, nor have any intention to do any injustice to Dr. Mitchell. As to the Smoky range and the mountains of Haywood county, wherever I do not find any name current among the people living about the mountain, I preserve the one attached to it by Mr. S. B. Buckley, in the publication of his meritorious measurements made in September, 1858. provided, however, that the points can be identified. Though these altitudes for the reasons assigned above will be found, I think, from fifty to eighty feet too high, yet they are very instructive approximations, for which we must be thankful to him. As to the highest group of the great Smoky Mountain, however, I must remark, that in the whole valley of the Tuckasege and Oconaluftee, I heard of but one name applied to the highest point, and it is that of Mount Clingman, the greatest authority around the peak, Robert Collins, Esq., knows of no other. This is but justice, for Mr. Clingman has for a long time directed his attention to that point. A year before the measurement took place, he invited me to ascertain its elevation, which I would have done if circumstances had allowed. He was the leader of a party which made, in 1858, the first measurement, and was composed, besides himself, of Mr. S. B. Buckley and Dr. S. L. Love. He caused Mr. Collins to cut a path of six miles to the top, which enabled me to carry there the first horse, kindly loaned by Colonel Robert G. A. Love, which was ever seen on these heights. It was would seem natural that the names of the three gentlemen of the party, and not that of one only, should be recalled by being applied to the three highest peaks which compose that group. The central or highest peak is therefore designated in the following list as Clingman's Dome, the south peak is next in height as Mount Buckley, the north peak as Mount Love. The name of Rev. Mr. Curtis, which was given by Mr. Buckley to Mount Love, is transferred to the western peak of Bullhead, the second in height to that group, the elevation of which was first ascertained by me in 1859.

To investigate the wild and extensive mountain tract of North Carolina is a long and arduous task, and I may be permitted to add an expensive one. For assuming it spontaneously and unaided I was prompted by no other motive than the desire of adding something to the knowledge of the scientific world, and to my own on the most interesting and most unknown portion of the great Alleghany range. It was, therefore, very gratifying to find among the many intelligent citizens of Western North Carolina, a lively interest in my enterprise, and a constant readiness in helping me, by giving in the most obliging manner all the information they could. It is a pleasure for me to return here, to all, my sincere thanks. To Hon. T. L. Clingman I am particularly indebted for much important information on the Black Mountain; to Mr. Blackstocks, of

Stocksville, for the communication of his survey of the same; to Dr. Hardy, of Asheville, for many kind services; to Professor W. C. Kerr, Davidson College, and his brother, for barometrical observations; to James R. Love, Esq., and his son, Col. Robt. G. Love, and Dr. S. L. Love, whose cordial hospitality I long enjoyed with my companions, and who rendered us all kinds of assistance, I am sincerely grateful; to Mr. W. A. Benners, of Waynesville, I am indebted for a long series of excellent barometrical observations that he made at my request. The aid of Mr. Jesse Stepp, my faithful guide in the Black Mountain, was to me invaluable; so was that of Mr. Brown, of Waynesville, for the mountain of Pigeon Valley, and quite particularly that of my excellent friend, Robt. Collins, Esq., of Oconaluftee Valley, for the Smoky Mountains. Mr. Collins placed himself and his sons at my disposal for more than a month and without his intelligent aid I scarcely could have succeeded, as I did, in exploring to my satisfaction that most wild and difficult portion of the mountains of North Carolina.

The following are the principal points, the altitude of which has been ascertained. The figures all refer to the ground of the places measured or to the waters in the rivers. The reduction to the level of the sea was derived from the levels of the Charleston and Cincinnati Railroad survey, the junction of Flat creek and Swannanoa river being assumed to be 2,250 feet above the level of the sea, and the ground at Asheville courthouse likewise 2,250 feet above the ocean.

VALLEY OF THE SWANNAHOA.

Eng. ft. above sea.

Junction of Flat Creek with Swannanoa River.....	2,250
Joseph Stepp's house	2,368
Burnett's house	2,423
Lower Mountain house—Jesse Stepp's floor of piazza.....	2,770
W. Patton's cabins end of carriage road.....	3,244
Resting Place brook behind last log cabin.....	3,955
Upper Mountain house.....	5,246
Ascending to Toe River Gap—passage main branch above Stepp's	3,902

IN THE BLUE RIDGE.

Toe River Gap between Potato Top and High Pinnacle.....	5,188
High Pinnacle of Blue Ridge.....	5,701
Rocky Knob's south peak.....	5,306
Big Spring on Rocky Knob.....	5,080
Grey Beard.....	5,448

Craggy Chain.

Big Craggy.....	6,090
Bull's Head	5,935
Craggy Pinnacle.....	5,945

BLACK MOUNTAIN MAIN CHAIN.

Potato Top ..	6,393
Mt. Mitchell.....	6,582
Mt. Gibbs.....	6,591
Stepp's Gap—the cabin.....	6,103

Eng. ft. above sea.

Mt. Hallback (or Sugarloaf).....	6,403
Black Dome (or Mitchell's High peak, or Clingman of State maps,	6,707
Dome Gap.....	6,352
Balsam Cone (Guyot of State maps).....	6,671
Hairy Bear.....	6,610
Bear Gap.....	6,234
Black Brother (Sandoz of State maps).....	6,619
Cattail Peak.....	6,611
Rocky Tail Gap.....	6,382
Dear Mt. North Point.....	6,233
Long Ridge South Point.....	6,208
Middle Point.....	6,259
North Point.....	6,248
Bowlen's Pyramid—North End.....	6,348

NORTHWESTERN CHAIN.

Blackstock's Knob.....	6,380
Yeates' Knob.....	5,975

CANBY RIVER VALLEY.

Green Ponds at T. Wilson's highest house,.....	3,222
T. Wilson's new house.....	3,110
Wheeler's—opposite Big Ivy Gap.....	2,942
Cattail Fork—junction with Canby River.....	2,873
Sandoz Gap, or Low Gap—summit of road.....	3,176
Burnsville—Court-house square.....	2,840
Green Mountain near Burnsville, highest point.....	4,340

GROUP OF THE ROAN MOUNTAIN.

Summit of the road from Burnsville to Toe River.....	3,139
Toe River Ford on the road from Burnsville to Roan Mountain..	2,131
Baily's Farm.....	2,379
Brigg's House, foot of the Roan Mountain—valley of Little Rock	
Creek.....	2,757
Yellow Spot, above Brigg's.....	5,158
Little Yellow Mount—highest.....	5,196
The Cold Spring—summit of Roan.....	6,132
Grassy Ridge Ball—northeast continuation of Roan Mountain...	6,230
Roan High Bluff.....	6,296
Roan High Knob.....	6,306

FROM BURNSVILLE TO GRANDFATHER MOUNTAIN.

South Toe River Ford.....	2,532
Toe River Ford, near Autrey's.....	2,547
North Toe River Ford, below Childsville.....	2,652
Blue Ridge—head of Brushy Creek.....	3,425
Linville River Ford, below head of Brushy Creek,.....	3,297
Linville River, at Piercy's.....	3,607
Headwaters of Linville and Watauga River, foot of Grandfather	
Mountain.....	4,100
Grandfather Mountain summit.....	5,897

Eng. ft. above sea.

Watauga River at Shull's Mill-pond,	2,917
Taylorville, Tennessee,	2,395
Whitetops, Virginia,	5,530

FROM BURNSVILLE TO THE BALD MOUNTAIN—OBSERVATIONS MADE BY PROFESSOR W. C. KERR, OF DAVIDSON COLLEGE—COMPUTED BY ME.

Sampson's Gap,	4,130
Egypt Cove at Proffit's,	3,320
Wolf's Camp Gap	4,359
Bald Mountain summit,	5,550

VALLEY OF THE BIG IVY CREEK.

Dillingham's house below Yeates Knob, or Big Butte,	2,568
Junction of the three forks,	2,276
Solomon Carter's house,	2,215
Stockville at Black Stock's,	2,216
Mouth of Ivy River, by railroad survey,	1,684

FROM ASHEVILLE TO MOUNT PISGAH.

Asheville Court-house,	2,250
Sulphur Springs—the Spring	2,092
Hominy Cove at Solomon Davies',	2,542
Little West Pisgah,	4,724
Great Pisgah,	5,757

BIG PIGEON VALLEY.

Forks of Pigeon, at Colonel Cathey's,	2,701
East Fork of Pigeon, at Captain T. Lenoir's,	2,855
Waynesville Court-house,	3,756
Sulphur Spring, Richland Valley at James R. G. Love's,	2,716
Mr. Hill's farm on Crab Tree Creek,	2,714
Crab Tree Creek below Hill's,	2,524
Cold Mountain,	6,063

CHAIN OF THE RICHLAND BALSAM.

Richland, between Richland Creek and the West Fork of Pigeon Creek and at E. Medford's,	2,938
E. Medford's farm, foot of Lickston's Mountain,	3,000
Lickston Mountain,	5,707
Deep Pigeon Gap,	4,907
Cold Spring Mountain,	5,915
Double Spring Mountain,	6,386
Richland Balsam or Caney Fork Balsam Divide,	6,425
Chimney Top,	6,234
Spruce Ridge Top,	6,076
Lone Balsam,	5,898
Old Bald,	5,786

CHAIN OF WESTENER'S BALD.

Westener Bald—North Peak,	5,414
Pinnacle,	5,692

GREAT MIDDLE CHAIN OF BALSAM MOUNTAINS BETWEEN SCOTT'S CREEK AND
LOW CREEK.

	Eng. ft. above sea.
Enos Plott's farm—north foot of chain	3,002
Old Field Mountain	5,100
Huckelberry Knob	5,484
Enos Plott's Balsam—first Balsam, north end.	6,097
Jones' Balsam—north point	6,223
South end	6,055
Rock Stand Knob	6,002
Brother Plott	6,246
Amos Plott's Balsam, or Great Divide	6,278
Rocky Face	6,031
White Rock Ridge	5,528
Black Rock	5,815
Panther Knob	5,359
Perry Knob	5,026

VALLEY OF SCOTT'S CREEK.

Love's sawmill	2,911
Maclure's farm	3,285
Road gap, head of Scott's Creek	3,357
John Brown's farm	3,049
Bryson's farm	2,173
John Love's farm	2,226
Webster Court House	2,203

— VALLEY OF TUCKASEGE AND TRIBUTARIES.

Tuckasege River mill, below Webster, near the road to Qualla- town	2,004
Junction of Savannah Creek	2,001
Junction of Scott's Creek	1,977
Quallatown Main Store	1,979
Soco River, Ford to Oconaluftee	1,990
Soco Gap—road summit	4,341
Amos Plott's farm on Pigeon	3,084
Oconaluftee River, junction Bradley fork	2,203
Robt. Collin's highest house	2,500
Junction of Raven's and Straight fork	2,476
Junction of Bunch's Creek	2,379

CHAIN OF THE GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAIN FROM NORTHEAST TO SOUTHWEST
FROM THE BOUND OF HAYWOOD COUNTY TO THE GAP OF LITTLE TENNESSEE.

The Pillar, head of Straight fork of Oconaluftee River	6,255
Thermometer Knob	6,157
Raven's Knob	6,230
Tricornor Knob	6,188
Mt. Guyot, (so named by Mr. Buckley in common).	6,636
Mt. Henry	6,373
Mt. Alexander	6,447
South Peak	6,299

	Eng. ft. above sea.
The True Brother, highest or central peak.....	5,907
Thunder Knob.....	5,682
Laurel Peak.....	5,922
Reinhardt Gap.....	5,220
Top of Richland Ridge.....	5,492
Indian Gap.....	5,317
Peek's Peak.....	6,232
Mt. Ocoana.....	6,135
Righthand or New Gap.....	5,096
Mt. Mingus.....	5,694

GROUP OF BULLHEAD, TENNESSEE.

Central Peak, or Mt. Lecompte.....	6,612
West Peak, or Mt. Curtis.....	6,568
North Peak, or Mt. Stafford.....	6,535
Cross Knob.....	5,921
Neighbor.....	5,771
Master Knob.....	6,013
Tomahawk Gap.....	5,450
Alum Cave.....	4,971
Alum Cave Creek, junction with Little Pigeon River.....	3,848

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAIN MAIN CHAIN.

Road Gap.....	5,271
Mt. Collins.....	6,188
Collins' Gap.....	5,720
Mt. Love.....	6,443
Clingman's Dome.....	6,660
Mt. Buckley.....	6,599
Chimney Knob.....	5,588
Big Stone Mountain.....	5,614
Big Cherry Gap.....	4,838
Corner Knob.....	5,246
Forney Ridge Peak.....	5,087
Snaky Mt.....	5,195
Thunderhead Mt.....	5,520
Eagletop.....	5,433
Spence Cabin.....	4,910
Turkey Knob.....	4,740
Opossum Gap.....	3,840
North Bald.....	4,711
The Great Bald's central peak.....	4,922
South Peak.....	4,708
Tennessee River at Hardin's.....	899
Hill House Mt., summit road to Montvale Springs.....	2,452
Montvale Springs, Tennessee.....	1,293

These measurements sufficiently indicate the grand traits of structure of that loftiest portion of the Appalachian system. It may be seen that the Roan and Grandfather Mountains are the two great pillars on both sides of the Northgate to the higher mountain region of North Carolina,

which entered between the two chains of the Blue Ridge on the east and the Iron and Smoky and Unaka Mountains on the west. That gate is almost closed by the Big Yellow Mountain. The group of the Black Mountain rises nearly isolated on one side in the interval between the two chains, touching by a corner the high Pinnacle, and overtowering all the neighboring chains by a thousand feet. In the large and comparatively deep basin of the French Broad Valley, the Blue Ridge is considerably depressed, while the Western chains preserves its increasing height. Beyond the French Broad rises the most massive cluster of highlands, and of mountain chains. Here the chain of the Great Smoky Mountain which extends from the deep cut of the French Broad at Paint Rock, to that, not less remarkable of the Little Tennessee, is the master chain of that region of the whole Alleghany system. Though its highest summits are a few feet below the highest peaks of the Black Mountain, it presents on that extent of sixty-five miles a continuous series of high peaks, and an average elevation not to be found in any other district, and which give to it a greater importance in the geographical structure of that vast system of mountains. The gaps or depressions never fall below five thousand feet except towards the southwest and beyond Forney Ridge, and the number of peaks, the altitude of which exceed six thousand feet, is indeed very large. On the opposite side to the southeast, the Blue Ridge also offers its most massive forms and reaches its greatest elevation on the compact cluster of mountains which fill the southern portion of Haywood and Jackson counties. Mount Hardy in the Blue Ridge, which according to Mr. Buckley, rises to sixty-two hundred and fifty-seven feet, though this elevation may be found too great, seems to be the culminating point of the Blue Ridge.

Moreover the interior between the Smoky Mountain and the Blue Ridge is filled with chains which offer peaks higher still than the latter. Amos Plott's Balsam in the midst of the great Balsam chain measures sixty-two hundred and seventy-eight feet; Richland, or Caney Fork Balsam, sixty-four hundred and twenty-five feet. Considering, therefore, these great features of physical structure, and the considerable elevation of the valleys which form the base of these high chains, we may say that this vast cluster of highlands between the French Broad and the Tuckasege rivers, is the culminating region of the great Appalachian system. As I intend this summer to visit the high group of mountains of the Cataluchee and those of south of Haywood county, as well as the Nantihala and others to the boundary of Georgia, I shall be happy to give you, for those who may be interested in these researches, the results of my further investigations.

I remain, very truly yours,

ARNOLD GUYOT,

Professor of Geology and Physical Geography, Princeton College, N. J.

[This speech and the one following it are presented to indicate the political condition of the country, with respect to party feelings and issues. Mr. Clay, from his youth, had been a leader of the Jeffersonian Republican party, and hence in principle did not differ essentially from General Jackson, likewise brought up in that school. Even on the tariff question, which seemed to be the chief material issue that affected the country, these two leaders did not differ much, both of them being merely in favor of protecting manufacturing establishments during their infancy, and until they had acquired strength sufficient to enable them to compete with the older establishments. Among the followers of each of them were both tariff and free trade men.

Hence, in party debates it was rather difficult to present any well marked line of division as to principles. The personal qualities of individuals, therefore, became more important, and that may be regarded rather as an age of political hero worship. The views of Mr. Clay and of General Jackson, therefore, seemed to constitute what were popularly regarded as the principles of the Whig and Democratic parties.]

SPEECH

ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE WHIG AND DEMOCRATIC PARTIES,
DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
MARCH 7, 1844.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not my purpose to debate the bill now under consideration. The gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Duncan,) who introduced it, thought proper to devote very little of his long speech to its merits. On the contrary, he declared that he did not feel capable of enlightening this House on any subject; that he had never, heretofore, spoken with that view; and that he was then about to make a speech for Buncombe.

As I am a citizen of that county, and have the honor of representing it on this floor, and as it has been my practice heretofore to reply to such individuals of his party as delivered political harangues to the citizens of my county, I regard it as proper for me to notice his effort of yesterday. I will suggest to the gentleman, however, for the benefit of any future exhibitions of this sort which he may be inclined to make, that he has utterly underrated the sagacity and mistaken the taste of my constituents. They are not quite gullible enough to swallow any portion of his doctrine, however well adapted it may be to the softer heads and coarser appetites of many of his own supporters.

During the two hours which, with the aid of his friends, the gentleman was able to obtain, he discussed the expenditures of government, Democracy and coon skins—spoke of toryism, tariff, proscription, and the peace party—denounced the bank, blue light federalism, and banners generally—condemned abolitionism, cider and the land distribution; he manifested much feeling against the Clay party and Whig songs, and went at large into the merits of bribery, frauds, the Hartford Convention, Van Burenism and Humbuggery; he also boasted largely of his knowledge of Greek, treated us to a lecture on the anatomy of the coon, and exhibited drawings of its entrails, which he declared he

intended to have engraved and published as a part of his speech. In addition to these matters, he said there were other things which he had not then time to go into, but which he intended to write out and circulate. That these topics have any relation to the bill of the gentleman, or to any bill which will probably ever be presented to this House, will not be pretended by anybody. But it was plain, Mr. Speaker, not only from the declarations of the gentleman himself, but from what we witnessed on this floor and from intimations in other quarters, that he was making a regular-built electioneering effort for distribution over the country. The fact, well known to everybody here, that he has been selected on this occasion by his party, as was their former custom, to promulgate their political doctrines, gives consequence to his effort of yesterday, and furnishes me a full apology for a reply. And if I should descend to things which seem trivial in themselves, or unworthy of the dignity of this House, I hope it will be borne in mind that whatever a great party adopts as its creed, is of consequence, however trifling or contemptible it may be in itself. Whatever our opponents regard as fitting to influence even the least enlightened part of the community, is worthy of examination.

The gentleman declared, at the outset of his remarks, that he should not trouble himself with details, but that he should deal in *wholesale falsehoods*. The latter part of this declaration he repeated with great emphasis. As but half the time will be allowed me that was extended to him, I, too, will be prevented from going into details; but I design to deal only in general *facts*.

On the subject of the expenditures of the government, it will not be necessary for me to say many words. The gentleman from Ohio alleged that the expenses of the present administration greatly exceeded those of Mr. Van Buren's; but as he did not give us the data on which he based his calculations, I presume we are to take it as one of his *wholesale* declarations. Taking the reports made by Mr. Van Buren's own officers as true, the total expenditures of his four years, independent of payments on account of public debt and trust funds, cannot be made less than the sum of \$112,000,000. But he says that many items of this expenditure were extraordinary, and refers particularly to the Florida war and some other things. Nothing, surely, Mr. Speaker, could be more extraordinary than some of those expenditures. For example: the sending from the forests of Florida to the city of New Orleans for wood, so as to make it cost \$20 per cord; the manner in which steamboats were employed, and many other items. When these matters were brought to the attention of the nation, in the canvass of 1840, the gentleman and his political friends, so far from condemning any of these expenditures, defended and justified them all. Sir, as they thought them right then, we are authorized in coming to the conclusion, that if they should get into power again, we should have a repetition of these extraordinary expenditures.

To show conclusively the improvidence and extravagance of the late administration, let me call your attention to some other facts. When Mr. Van Buren came into power, he found in the Treasury, including the fourth installment which ought to have been distributed among

the States, the large sum of \$17,109,473! There also came into the Treasury during his term, from the sale of the United States Bank stock and other sources than the ordinary revenue, the sum of \$9,124,747! And he left a debt due, by outstanding Treasury notes, of \$5,648,512! It thus appears that he not only expended all the revenues arising from the existing tariff, and from the sales of the public lands, but, in addition thereto, he expended the whole of the above large sum, viz: \$31,882,732! for he did not leave a single million in the Treasury. If he expended no more than was necessary, then he and his party were highly culpable; because they neglected to provide means to sustain the government, without depriving the States of the fourth installment, which was due to them under the existing law, and without leaving the government in debt. But, if the existing laws were sufficient to provide the government with the means of paying its current expenses, then it is clear that he expended \$31,882,732 too much.

Gentlemen cannot escape one or the other of these conclusions. But to show still more strongly the gross mismanagement as well as the reckless extravagance of that administration, let me bring to the attention of the House another fact. On the 4th of March, 1841, when Mr. Van Buren left the administration of the government, there were, as appears from House Document, No. 281 :

Specific undrawn appropriations of all kinds - - -	\$27,144,721 30
Indefinite appropriations drawn between the 4th of March and 31st of December, 1841, - - -	1,771,267 46
Treasury notes outstanding on the 4th of March, 1841, \$	5,648,512 00
There were, besides other liabilities then existing, arising out of Indian treaties, balances due militia, for navy pension fund, post office debt, taking the census, printing, Greenough's statue, and various other small items, enumerated in Document 62 and acts of last Congress, and Document 293, which, together, make the sum of - - - - -	3,518,835 00

Adding all these, we have the total liabilities thrown
upon the Whigs, when they came into power, to be 38,065,378 76

And now let us see what means existed to meet this heavy liability. The total amount of revenue which came in that year from customs, land sales, bonds of the United States Bank, and all other sources, after deducting the sum produced by the Whig tariff on luxuries, and the \$2,428,247 expended before the 4th of March by the rejected administration, amounted to \$13,000,000. Add to this the cash on hand in the Treasury, \$862,055, and we have the sum of \$13,862,055, as the whole amount which arose from all the sources provided by that administration.

How, then, stands the account? The administration of Mr. Van Buren left the government liable for the sum of \$38,065,378 in that year, and all the means provided to pay it amounted to but \$13,862,055, which, subtracted from the liabilities, leaves an excess of

the latter of \$24,203,323. This large sum of twenty-four millions can be looked upon in no other light than a debt left by Mr. Van Buren's administration. Let us *now* see how the account stands. Mr. Van Buren, when he came into power had, as above stated, a surplus of \$26,234,220. He went out, having expended this, leaving the government involved, above its means of paying, for the sum of \$24,203,323. Putting them together, the surplus spent and the debt left, we have the vast sum of \$50,437,543. We are, therefore, brought to the startling conclusion, that if Mr. Van Buren had come into office as most of the Presidents did, without any surplus on hand, he would have left the government fifty millions in debt. Whether gentlemen attribute this to his extravagance, or simply to his bad management in providing means for carrying on the government, is not at all material. They must come to one of these conclusions, and either is decisive against his capacity to administer the government of the country.

Should the last half of the expenditures of this year be equal to the first, the total expenses of the present administration for its four years will not reach \$85,000,000. This, subtracted from the aggregate expenditures of Mr. Van Buren's four years, as above stated, leaves the sum of more than twenty-seven millions, showing thereby that by ejecting him from office this immense sum has been saved to the country in four years.

With respect, however, to this administration, I will say that the Whigs are not responsible for it generally, and that I feel under no obligation to defend it. When Mr. Tyler proved himself false to the Whig party, and abandoned its principles, we made a full surrender of him to our adversaries. But our conveyance was accompanied by no warranty either of title or soundness. The Democracy took him at their own risk. They cannot hold us responsible, because our assignment was without recourse, and without consideration. It is unkind in the gentleman from Ohio now to assail Mr. Tyler. He and his friends might have done so with great propriety. They might have imitated the magnanimity of Julius Cæsar, who, if he loved the treason, despised the traitor. But they did not do so; on the contrary, they courted his alliance; and, now, after having seduced, embraced, and made use of him—having disgraced him in the estimation of all the world—finding that he is soon to lose his official station, and that he can no longer be turned to account, they are endeavoring to expel him from the fold of the Democratic party, and turn him adrift in the world, friendless and alone, to depend on its cold charities. But he is unwilling to be thus unceremoniously expelled. He insists, through his official organs, that, inasmuch as he has done more to defeat the Whig measures than any one else, and thereby rendered the greatest service to the Democratic party, he ought, in all fairness, to receive the nomination of their convention, affirms that Mr. Van Buren has no chance to beat Mr. Clay, and claims to be the only man in their ranks capable of succeeding. In this, perhaps, exists the secret cause of the attack of the member from Ohio. He designs, by a sudden thrust, to remove a rival from the path of his

favorite. I submit it to him, in all candor, to decide whether it is not ungenerous and ungrateful in him thus to assail his ally. He ought not to lift his hand against his brother.

Let us now, Mr. Speaker, proceed to inquire what are the principles of the present self-styled "Democratic party," about which the gentleman from Ohio has talked so much? It will be found on examination, that this party is governed by seven principles—as John Randolph is reported to have said of Thomas Ritchie—the five loaves and the two fishes. Or, in the language of John C. Calhoun, late a distinguished leader of this party, remarkable for his powers of generalization and condensation, and who was, thereby, enabled to analyse, simplify, and reduce to a single element these various principles, it is the "spoils party, held together by the cohesive attraction of public plunder!"

I shall endeavor to show, Mr. Speaker, in all the candor and sincerity on my part, that no injustice is done to the party by this definition of its principles. On the contrary, it is my deliberate, well settled, solemn conviction that the leaders of the party are held together by no other bond whatever. If an individual will only vote for them; if he will give them his influence in carrying elections, and promoting them to office, he will be considered a good Democrat, no matter how opposite his opinions on all questions of public policy may be to those which they happen to be professing at that time. I intend this remark of course only to apply to the politicians; for I am well aware that the great mass of the party in the country are honest and patriotic, and that they have been merely deceived by the professions of Democracy and love for the interest of the people, made by their leaders.

Without traveling out of the ground occupied by the gentleman from Ohio, I expect to be able to establish the truth of my position that his party is united only upon the principle above stated. The question which is likely to occupy more of our time during the present session than any other, is the tariff; and how does the party stand on that? Martin Van Buren, their generally acknowledged leader, voted not only for the tariff of 1824, but he also voted for that of 1828, (the highest tariff which ever existed in the country,) and which, because of its very excess, was condemned by Mr. Clay, Mr. Webster, and many other Whigs. Mr. Senator Wright, the confidential friend of Van Buren always, and the present Congressional leader of the party on all such questions, not only likewise voted for that same extravagant tariff of 1828, but he was mainly instrumental in carrying it through. He even voted for the Whig tariff of 1842, against which such an outcry is now raised; and so did Mr. Senator Buchanan, another great Democratic leader, and but lately one of their candidates for the Presidency. I need not, however, multiply instances of this sort, but will ask if the whole party are united on tariff principles with these prominent individuals? Not at all, sir. When you look to the Southern section of the Union, you find among the Democrats, Free Trade men and Nullifiers, who are utterly hostile to all tariffs, denounce them as unconstitutional, systems only of fraud and plunder, and even, in some instances, are willing to dissolve the Union to get rid

of them. Do these individuals complain of and denounce their Democratic allies of the North for voting for these high tariffs? No, sir. They embrace them most lovingly, stand shoulder to shoulder with them, like Siamese twins, and keep up a common struggle for political power. But they do denounce Mr. Clay and the Whigs because they are in favor of a moderate, steady tariff. The party is thus divided into two sections, which profess opposite principles, with a view of increasing thereby its political strength. In the South there is much opposition to the tariff, and on that account the Southern Democrats denounce it with great vehemence, with the expectation of chiming in with the prevalent feeling of the people there, and thus acquiring popularity for their party; while at the North, where the tariff policy is favored, their Democratic allies are warmly in favor of it, with a view of carrying the elections in that quarter. By thus manœuvring they expect that each wing will be able to bring a larger capital to the common stock, to enable them to get control of the offices and money of the country. The Whigs, on the contrary, being governed by principle, find that their representative, Mr. Clay, is denounced at the South as being too strongly in favor of the tariff, while at the North he is charged with not going far enough in support of the protective policy. Mr. Van Buren himself is a fitting representative of his party. While he votes for high tariffs, makes sheep speeches at the North, and writes letters to Indiana in favor of the protective policy, to Virginia he writes a letter strongly denouncing it. Do gentlemen intend to persevere in this system of deception? Or do they hope to be able to cheat the country longer by such barefaced double dealing? Why do they not show us on this floor what they are for? They know what the Whig tariff is, and why do they not let us see theirs? The Committee of Ways and Means have had the subject under consideration some three months, and why have we not had a report? What are you afraid of, sir? Is it that you cannot unite your party on any bill? You have a majority of nearly two to one on this floor; can you not bring them up to the mark? Show us your hand, and let the country know what you are for. Further concealment or shuffling is no longer practicable.

You know that we Whigs are for a tariff. [What sort of a tariff are you for? said Mr. Payne.] I will endeavor, Mr. Speaker, to tell the gentleman from Alabama what sort of a tariff I am for, and what I understand the Whig party to be in favor of. We are in favor of such a tariff as will produce all the revenue necessary to the support of the government, economically administered, without the money arising from the sales of the public lands. This latter fund we desire to see distributed among the States, to enable those States that are indebted to pay back to their creditors what they have borrowed, to remove the cloud which rests on the honor of some of them, and place American credit where it used to stand, and to furnish the States not indebted with the means of diffusing the benefits of education among every class of their citizens, so that our voters hereafter may understand their rights as inhabitants of this free Republic, and no longer be the victims of the arts of demagogues. And, in raising a revenue

by means of duties, we are not for adopting them on the principles of the horizontal tariff, for which a portion of the gentleman's party were voting early in the session. That is a system so absurd that it has not yet been adopted by any nation, and probably never will exist on the earth, however firm may be its resting place in the imaginations of some of its votaries.

Still less are we inclined to support such a tariff as that recommended in the last resolution offered, which received the support of the majority of the Democratic party on this floor, and which was so near being adopted, viz; adjusting the duties with reference to revenue alone, and making discriminations with that view only. In other words, so adjusting the duties as to raise the largest sum on each article.

That system, if carried out, would throw its burdens mainly on the necessities of life, because they would come in at any price. Salt, for example, being an article of prime necessity, must be procured by everybody, no matter what might be its price; and the heaviest duty would therefore be imposed on it under this principle, so as to get the greatest amount of revenue; while jewelry, silks, and wines, being mere luxuries, which nobody is obliged to have, would be excluded by a high duty, and therefore must be admitted with a moderate one only. We are in favor of no such system as this; but we do advocate such a discrimination as, while it is so modified as not to be burdensome to any class of the community, may afford incidental protection to our manufacturers and artizans, to sustain our own industry against the oppressive regulations of others, and countervail, as far as practicable, the hostile restrictions of foreign nations. This last was a favorite principle of General Jackson, and I commend it to the attention of gentlemen on the other side. It was also a doctrine of Mr. Jefferson; in fact, he went so far at one time as to express the opinion, that we ought to imitate the Chinese, make everything we need at home, and have as little as possible to do with other nations. I may add, sir, that there has not been a single President, from Washington down to the present incumbent of the executive chair, inclusive, who has not sanctioned discrimination on these principles.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we should take a common sense practical view of this question. We have had theory and parade enough on it.

I tell gentlemen that I am not at present inclined to support any tariff bill which they are likely to bring forward at this session. In making this declaration, I speak only for myself. The tariff of 1842, which is now in operation, may have defects, for what I know. Some of the duties may be too high, and others too low. But, sir, it has thus far disappointed all the predictions of its enemies. They told us that the duties were so high that they would be prohibitory; that we should get no revenue under it, and therefore be obliged to resort to direct taxation to support the government. But facts, as daily developed, directly refute this prediction. The revenue under it has been rapidly increasing; and if it should continue for the balance of the year as it has been coming in for the last three months, it would

amount to some fifty millions of dollars. Though I do not, of course, anticipate, in fact, that amount, yet I am quite sure that if the present tariff were permitted to remain undisturbed, it would not only afford us all the means necessary to support the government, but enable us, in a short time, to pay off the whole of our national debt. This favorable state of our finances has been produced thus far without any practical injury having resulted to any section of the country. Not only cotton, but all of our other productions, command a better price than they did before the passage of the tariff; while foreign articles, which we import and consume, are generally cheaper, I believe I might say invariably so. But even if it were otherwise, I would be willing, as an individual, and I know my constituents are patriotic enough to feel willing too, to submit to a temporary inconvenience for the sake of seeing this government once more free from the debt left by Mr. Van Buren, and able to support itself without borrowing, or resorting to the land money, so that the latter fund might be distributed among the States. We might thereby relieve the National and State governments from embarrassment, and place American character and credit on their former basis. But when these results are about to be produced by a tariff that is actually conferring benefits instead of burdens on the community, is it not something worse than folly to repeal it?

To illustrate my view still further, Mr. Speaker, allow me to put a case to the member from Ohio, (Mr. Duncan) which I have no doubt he will understand and feel the force of. From the manner in which he lectured us on the entrails of the coon, I take it that he is a doctor. Is it not so? [Mr. Duncan was understood to nod an assent.] Then, suppose he had been practicing on an individual for four years, and that under his administration of medicines the disorder of the patient had increased daily; that he had become more and more feeble, until his dissolution seemed at hand. When thus on the brink of the grave, he is advised to change his physician; he does so, and at once begins to recover, regains his strength and spirits, and is able to return to his former business. The gentleman then meets him, and tells him that he is about to be ruined; that the medicines he has been taking are too strong, have cured him too suddenly, and thereby destroyed his constitution; and recommends him to return to his prescription. Would the gentleman expect the patient to follow his advice? He does not think proper to answer my question. I will answer it, by telling him that I am not willing to trust him and his party, who brought the country into such difficulty. We expect to elect Mr. Clay, and get into power again in some twelve months; and if, after a trial till then, we find the tariff needs alteration, those who originally made it can modify it.

Having thus, Mr. Speaker, shown that the several fragments of the Democratic party have no common principles in relation to the tariff, I shall proceed still further to support my original position, that they are kept together solely by the love of office, by adverting to another question which has occupied more of our time than any other during the present session, viz: abolition, or the proper mode of treating

abolition petitions. The gentleman declared that the Whigs were Abolitionists, but he did not think it worth while, it seems, to offer any proof on the point, contenting himself with making a *wholesale* charge. [Mr. Duncan here rose to explain.] Mr. Speaker, I have but a single hour to answer the gentleman's two hour's speech, and I cannot consent to give up any part of it to explanations. The gentleman's own course affords a fair illustration of that of his party on this question. At the beginning of the session, when the famous 21st rule was under consideration for the first time, he dodged the vote on it. A good deal having been said in the papers about his so doing, he came in a few weeks afterwards, and made a long speech against the rule, showing that it was unconstitutional, inexpedient, and utterly mischievous. On Tuesday of last week, however, when the House was voting on it, he dodged the question again; but on the next day, upon the last vote taken, he came in and voted in *favor of the rule*. He has thus, during the present session, been once against the rule, once in favor of it, and twice has he dodged the vote.

When we look abroad over the country, Mr. Speaker, how does his party stand on this question? Why, he knows very well that, even in his own State, Morris, a late Democratic Senator in Congress, and Tappan, the present Senator, elected by the same party, are Abolitionists. And in Massachusetts, Marcus Morton, their standing candidate for Governor and the only man they have ever been able to elect in that State, is an ultra Abolitionist; and for that very reason selected by them to secure the votes of the Abolitionists. You remember, sir, what a shout of joy was raised by the whole Democratic party, when it was ascertained that he had gotten in by a single vote. And, sir, the very resolutions from Massachusetts, which created such excitement at the beginning of the session—the resolutions, I mean, proposing to abolish slave representation in this House, were passed by the first, and indeed the only, Democratic legislature that the party ever have had in that State—and that, too, by a unanimous vote. Yes, sir, their party signalized their first triumph in the State of Massachusetts by passing these resolutions, which, if carried out would at once dissolve the Union. But the Southern members of the Democratic party on this floor, especially my colleague, (Mr. Saunders) endeavor to divert public attention from that fact, by making patriotic speeches against the Hartford Convention. They say that the very proposition of these resolves had its origin in that famous convention, and was one of its leading recommendations. Sir, I have no objection to this measure being traced for its origin to that convention. That was a justly odious body; and I should be pleased to see all propositions to dissolve this Union traced to such a parent. But, taking all this to be true, they cannot thus get out of the difficulty in which they are involved. The Hartford Convention produced this great political monster, as they denounce it to be; and, after it had existed for more than a quarter of a century, and its deformity had thereby become manifest to all the world, their party, as soon as they came into power, eagerly embraced, adopted it and made it thus their own.

Let us look a little further. Garrison and Leavitt, editors of the leading Abolition papers at the North, as I am informed, attend the Van Buren meetings, get resolutions passed denouncing Mr. Clay as a slaveholder, and are esteemed good Democrats.

Why, sir, what have we witnessed on this floor during the present session? The leading speech against the twenty-first rule, as it is commonly called, was made by a gentleman from New York, (Mr. Beardsley) generally understood all over the North to be high in the confidence of Martin Van Buren, and supposed to represent his views; and the Democratic papers in New York and elsewhere claim great credit on this account for their party, saying that this Democratic Congress is opposed to the gag rule of the Whig Congress. Though our opponents have two to one on this floor, yet when we get them to a direct vote, the rule is defeated by a large majority. Out of nearly eighty Democratic members on this floor from the free States, with all possible coaxing, they can get only thirteen to vote in favor of the rule. How is it with the Southern wing of the party? Its members make most vehement speeches in favor of the rule, declare that the Union will be dissolved if it is abolished, and charge as high treason all opposition to it. Do they complain of their Northern allies for deserting them on this all-important question? No, sir; there is too good an understanding between them for this. But, in their speeches made for home consumption, they give it out that this all-important rule is likely to be defeated, because half a dozen Whigs from the South are against it. They are especially vehement in their denunciation of me, and desire to make the impression that its loss, if it should be rejected, is mainly to be attributed to my speech against it. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have an opportunity of alluding to this topic, because, after set speeches had been made against me daily for two months, the party refused to allow me a single hour to reply.* The game which they have been playing off is seen through by everybody here, and it is getting to be understood in the country. There was a time when gentlemen, by giving themselves airs and talking largely of Southern rights in connection with this subject, were able to give

* I consider it as due to myself to state that I have long been thoroughly convinced that opposition to the reception of Abolition petitions, one form of which is the twenty-first rule, had its origin in a political manœuvre some eight or ten years since. A certain prominent Southern politician, seeing that his course had rendered him unpopular generally, seized upon this question, to create excitement between the North and South, and unite the South thereby into a political party, of which he expected to be the head. There are also individuals at the North who, though professing opposition to the rule, are, in my opinion, really desirous of its continuance, as a means of producing agitation in that quarter. A portion of them entertain the hope that the excitement there may attain a sufficient height to enable them successfully to invade the institutions of the South; but the larger number are simply seeking to produce a strong prejudice in the popular mind in the free States against Southern institutions and men, on which to base a political party strong enough to control the offices of the country. Had an opportunity been afforded me, it was my purpose to have adverted to some facts in support of these opinions. Entertaining, myself, no doubt whatever of their correctness, there was but one course for me to take with respect to the existence of the rule.

themselves consequence at home. But that day has passed. Its mock tragedy has degenerated into downright farce, and nobody will be humbugged much longer in this way. But the matter is important in one respect. Nothing could more fully show the utter profligacy of the party, its total want of all principle, than the course of its Northern and Southern wings on this question. They hope, however, by thus spreading their nets, to drag in votes in both sections of the Union, and thereby get into power.

Still further to create a prejudice against me individually, they pretend that those members from the South who, in the last Congress, opposed the rule, were defeated on that account; and Messrs. Stanly and Botts were referred to. Now, sir, my colleague, (Mr. Saunders) who was one of those that endeavored to create this impression, knows very well how Mr. Stanly was defeated. He knows very well that the last legislature of our State, being a Democratic one, made a district purposely to defeat Mr. Stanly. They threw into his district some fifteen hundred Democratic votes, making, as they supposed, a clear majority of near one thousand votes against him. He, however, greatly reduced this majority. Notwithstanding his opposition to the 21st rule, he ran ahead of his party strength and if the sword of Brennus had not been thrown into the scale, Edward Stanly would have been here on this floor, to defend his votes against all assailants.

We come next to Mr. John M. Botts. It would hardly be fair, would it, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask you, situated as you are, how that matter was? [The Speaker shook his head, and smiled.] Then I will state what I understand to be the facts. There, too, I have been informed that your party, who had the majority in the legislature, took especial pains to have Mr. Botts left at home. They threw a clear majority of some eight hundred votes against him in the new district which they made, and how far was it that you beat him? Some thirty-two votes, I think. I learn, further, that in those counties which belonged to his old district, his majority was five hundred votes larger than it had ever been before. Does this look as if his active opposition to the 21st rule had weakened his strength or diminished his speed? If, however, it should be thought that the citizens of the Old Dominion did not fully understand his position, and had not fairly opened their eyes to the enormity of his course, I learn from him, as he is now here, contesting your seat, that he is perfectly willing to try the matter over again.

But my colleague, (Mr. Saunders) in the course of his speech some time since, declared that he felt for my painful position, and that he extended to me his sympathy. I am infinitely obliged to him for his kind feeling; but I tell him I have no need of his sympathy. I decline to take it. Let him keep it for a worthier object and a more fitting occasion. I tell him, Mr. Speaker, and I mean no disrespect to my colleague by the remark, I would not change places with him on this question for a cabinet appointment or a London mission to boot. My constituents know I do not need his sympathy. Whatever opinion they may entertain of me in other respects, they know that I will not hesitate to take any position that I regard as right, and that I will not

feel uncomfortable in that position. The gentleman also said, in the course of his speech, that the people of my section would not approve my course on this question. If I have been correctly informed, this is not the first prediction that that gentleman has made with reference to me. In the year 1840, he canvassed our State for the office of Governor. I was also a candidate at that time, in a district composed of several counties, for a seat in the State Senate. We had some passages at arms; and I afterwards heard that he expressed the opinion that I would probably be beaten, because I had gone out of my way to assail him. [Mr. Saunders said it was a mistake; he had not made such a declaration.] I am glad of it, for the sake of the gentleman's reputation as a prophet; for I not only beat my competitor more than two to one, but my constituents, in their generosity, gave me a larger vote than any one else has ever received in our State for that station. But the gentleman, at least, did say here that my constituents would not be pleased with my course. This may or may not be true. I may, perhaps, be beaten; but I shall not, at any rate, be beaten as Stanly and Botts were. There can be no gerrymandering to affect me. My district is unapproachable. She stands alone in her strength, and dreads no contact with the Democracy. On the contrary, she courts it. She would gladly embrace in either arm the two strongest Democratic districts in the State; and they would fall under that grasp as did the columns of the Philistine edifice before the strength of Sampson.

I will make a prediction for my colleague. He will find that the Whiggism of that district has lost none of its spirit since 1840, but that it exists in increased strength and energy, and when November comes, the western reserve will send down from her mountains such a majority for Harry of the West as will sweep unresisted over the old North State.

I will now, Mr. Speaker, advert to another matter, with a view of still further supporting the leading position with which I set out—that the party is only governed by the single principle above stated. Whenever any declaration of principle is brought forward as a mere abstract proposition, and such things always come from the Southern members, the whole party vote for it with great unanimity. If, however, something practical comes up, any measure likely to affect the interests of the community, the party at once divides—the Northern fragment voting in accordance with the interests of their constituents, and abandoning their Southern brethren. There seems to be a tacit understanding among them all, that every measure which is effective for good or evil shall be carried in accordance with the wishes of the Northern members of the party, inasmuch as they are best pleased with something tangible, substantial, real. In consideration of getting the measures they want, they, by an easy effort, stretch their understandings or consciences, so as to adopt any mere abstract proposition that may sound most pleasantly in the ears of their Southern friends, who have thus far, from their conduct at least, seemed to think that they have the better side of the bargain, and appear to be much delighted therewith.

A distinguished modern French philosopher (M. Comte) says that science exists in three stages. The first he denominates the religious or superstitious age, in which men attribute the effects they witness to the direct agency of supernatural beings. Progressing somewhat beyond this, they reach what he terms the metaphysical age, during which they fashion in their minds abstract creations, to whose agency they refer the various changes that are going on in the world. The third stage, which he regards as the summit of our advancement, he denominates the positive or practical, during the existence of which men analyze facts and ascertain truth. Taking these definitions as guides, it is obvious that a considerable party in the country, having its main root in the State of Virginia, but branching into South Carolina and some other States, has attained only this second or metaphysical state, beyond which, in fact, it does not seem destined to pass, having made no progress whatever for many years. Its notions bear the same relation to sound political science that the logic of Aristotle and the schoolmen does to the Baconian philosophy of our day. With its members theory is everything, while facts, instead of being "stubborn things," are accounted as nothing. When contemplating them, one is constantly reminded of the ancient philosopher, who desired to be blind, in order that he might study nature to advantage. This sect, forming as it does a large part of the Southern wing of the Democratic party, is, from its mental constitution, therefore, constantly liable to be imposed on, and is easily humbugged by its more calculating and shrewder allies of the North. In the progress of matter we occasionally witness some very amusing scenes. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that on Monday of last week certain resolutions were offered to this House, which, it seems, had been previously adopted at the Democratic Convention, which met at Baltimore in 1840, as a part of its creed, and which were supposed by some persons to occupy the very highest Southern ground against the tariff and abolition. These resolutions being the very essence of abstraction itself, that is, so general and vague as to mean nothing at all, passed this House with very little opposition. On the succeeding day we were called upon to vote on the adoption of the twenty-first rule. Thereupon, a gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Campbell) for whom I entertain a high respect personally, called for the reading of the resolution of the previous day on the subject of abolition. The gentleman, and some others, seemed to think that the party was concluded by the adoption of that resolution, and must of course, to be consistent, vote for the rule. Instead, however, of going for it unanimously, as they had done for the resolution, it was lost by a majority of twenty votes. On such occasions there is sometimes a family jar. The Southerners complain of bad faith, while those from the North insist that the South is too exacting, that they have already, to oblige them, voted for many resolutions, the recollection even of which is most humiliating. The quarrel, however, is easily reconciled. The Northern Democrats consent to vote for the most abstract resolutions which Southern ingenuity can frame, and the parties shake hands and are reconciled, as brethren should be.

The result of this practice I regard as most unfortunate for the country. If public men and parties habitually profess doctrines which they have no purpose of carrying into practice, it not only destroys the confidence of the community in politicians, but it corrupts the public morals, and will eventually end in the destruction of the government.

Having shown, Mr. Speaker, that on these important questions the so-called Democratic party is governed by no other principle than the one ascribed to it by Mr. Calhoun, I will proceed to the consideration of some other topics, which will afford arguments not less cogent and convincing. Let us look, in the first place, to its course on the sub-Treasury scheme. When this measure was first proposed by Mr. Gordon, of Virginia, in the year 1834, it was denounced by the leading organs and politicians of the party as "disorganizing and revolutionary, and subversive of the fundamental practice of the government from its very origin," and the whole of their followers with one voice condemned it. As soon, however, as Mr. Van Buren became President, in his very first message he recommended its adoption. Thereupon, the mass of the party shifted its position, and at once came into the support of the very measure which they had denounced. Indeed, no battalion, under the order of its commander, on a parade day, ever changed fronts more suddenly. What are we to think of their adhesion to principle? How very different was the conduct of the Whig party, when placed in a similar emergency. When John Tyler came into office, he possessed the confidence of the whole party. He suddenly abandoned his principles; and did that party follow him? No, sir; with all the patronage of the government in his hands, he could not carry off "a corporal's guard." They clung only the closer to their principles, and denounced him whom they had but just elevated to power. Yet, sir, it required high intellect and lofty patriotism to pass that fiery ordeal unscathed. History, in all its pages, affords no such example of devotion to principle, manifested by an immense political mass, as we exhibited on that occasion. If the country ever had doubts as to who was most worthy of his confidence, the noble bearing of the great Whig party in that trying emergency was sufficient to dispel them. Those who held high political stations in the administration all abandoned him. He, therefore, turned his attention to his former political adversaries, and his proffered embraces were not rejected. He had office to bestow, and they were the spoils party, and few and short were the words of wooing. He found himself at once in the bosom of the party, and most lovingly did they move on together, until it became necessary to kill him off for the benefit of a longer tried and dearer object of affection. Hence the denunciation that has been heaped upon John Tyler by the Van Buren press.

This self-styled Democratic party, in its efforts to attain political power, stops at nothing, hesitates at nothing. What have we witnessed, sir, during this very session? Heretofore, several of the States of the Union had adopted the general ticket system of electing representatives to Congress. The result was, that the members thus elected ceased to be the representatives of the people, as the Constitution

intended them to be, and were in fact only representatives of irresponsible caucuses of the dominant parties in each State. The last Congress, seeing that if this mode was persevered in, and generally adopted, a total revolution would be effected in our political system, in execution of a power expressly given in the Federal Constitution, passed a law requiring that the members should in future be elected from single districts. Whatever difference of opinion might exist as to the expediency of this law, it was to have been hoped that at least it would be obeyed by all till it was repealed by the same authority that had passed it. Four States, however, in open defiance of its provisions, elected their representatives by general ticket. When they arrived here, the dominant party, to which they all belonged but two, seeing that the general ticket mode of election favored their view of stripping the people of power, and centralizing it in the hands of a few politicians, by means of the caucus system which it called into play, admitted these individuals to seats, as members on this floor, in direct violation of the law of the land, thereby exhibiting the monstrous example of the law makers of a country disregarding and nullifying, and thus bringing into general contempt their own laws. I will not say, sir, that the members of the majority may not have believed themselves justified, but I do declare that no argument I have heard made here, in defence of their course, was, in my judgment, sufficiently ingenious or plausible to have induced the dullest jury I ever saw in an inferior court to acquit a defendant on the State docket. Let me remind you, sir, of another part of that transaction. After the resolution of the gentleman from New York, (Mr. Barnard) embodying the protest of the Whig members against the proceedings of the majority, had been on the journal some days, and votes had been taken on it, according to all the principles of parliamentary law, under which we were then acting, it was entitled to a place on the journal. In addition to this was the binding force of our Federal Constitution, which we had all taken an oath to support, and which required us to keep a journal of our proceedings; yet, sir, because that protest contained matter which condemned their course, and was on that account offensive to them, they coolly and deliberately expunged the whole resolution and protest from the journal, thereby making it tell a falsehood to our constituents and to after ages.

It is not long, Mr. Speaker, since the members of this same *Democratic* party, happening to have a majority in the Senate of the Tennessee Legislature, for two whole years refused to join in the election of Senators to Congress, leaving their State thereby entirely unrepresented, and thus violated the Constitution which they had sworn to support; because they feared that Whigs might be elected. If this were only the act of that most ignominious "thirteen," it would not be worthy of notice here; but their party, throughout the Union, instead of joining the Whigs in denouncing such a lawless act, generally defended and applauded it, as an evidence of their devotion to their party. Even the Dorr rebellion is patronized by this same party. Thomas W. Dorr, perhaps the greatest coward chronicled in history, with a band of hired ruffians from the city of New York, without a

shadow of right, invades the gallant little State of Rhode Island with a view of overturning the Constitution, and making himself master of affairs. Her brave citizens take arms to defend their government; and Mr. Dorr, on both occasions, leaves his army and runs away the night before he expects a fight to take place. His followers being disheartened, and finding that they are likely to get more of blows than of the booty promised them, surrender. Yet this Dorr, and his followers, deserving nothing but detestation for their wickedness, and for their cowardice still more contemptible than they are wicked, find advocates and eulogists in both Houses of Congress, as well as throughout the country, among the leaders of the Locofoco party; and the moral sense of the country is shocked by hearing them compared to Washington and the other heroes of our Revolution.

What do they think of repudiation itself? A State borrows money, and uses it; and she afterwards refuses to pay the debt, and repudiates it; and this monstrous doctrine, instead of being everywhere denounced, instead of being met by one universal shout of execration, is in some quarters excused and defended. I rejoice, however, that no Whig can be numbered among its apologists. If there was such an individual in our ranks, I should desire to see him at once expelled from the party. It is a question about which I, for one, cannot consent to temporize. With the opinions I hold, it would be criminal in me not to denounce it on all proper occasions. It is a cancer in our system, which, if not removed, will destroy our national character, and everything else which we ought most to value. Important as is character to individuals, it is still more so to States. When a people have lost all sense of national honor, the immutable laws of Providence forbid them to be anything but *slaves*.

And, sir, members of the party which has performed, defended and applauded all these things, undertake to lecture us on morals, and express great apprehension lest the country should be corrupted by Clay banners and Whig songs. But I will pursue this part of the subject no further. The facts I have already adverted to are sufficient to satisfy every impartial mind of the truth of the proposition, that the leaders of this party are united only for the purpose of carrying elections and obtaining office, and are held together solely by the "cohesive power of public plunder."

I will now proceed, Mr. Speaker, to remark on some other topics introduced by the gentleman from Ohio. It is insisted that justice requires the restoration of Mr. Van Buren to office. He uses the argument himself substantially in his letters, and his friends generally make it their strongest point. The argument, briefly stated is this: He was ejected from office in 1840, by means of the charges and denunciations brought against him by the Whigs. The Democracy was thereby wronged, humiliated, and degraded, in his person and by his sufferings. Justice to the injured feelings and wounded spirit of that Democracy requires that he should be restored to office. Well, sir, if this argument be sound, it applies with equal force to Richard M. Johnson, the Vice-President, who was put out with Mr. Van Buren. It covers, too, an immense multitude who were denounced and driven

out by us. Swartwout, Boyd, Harris, the whole army of defaulters, have the same reason to complain of Whig denunciation and expulsion. You remember, sir, how numerous they were; out of sixty odd land receivers, about fifty proved defaulters, to say nothing of the other branches of the government. They have all been kept out of office; in fact, I believe we have not had a single defalcation in the three years since Mr. Van Buren went out. These men have strong claims, under this argument, to be restored to their former privileges and immunities.

And are not its measures as dear to the party as its men? If so, the argument applies to them to, and you must restore the large expenditures and the army bill.

The ghost of the sub-Treasury which we denounced more and killed off sooner than anything else, might stalk over the land haunting the Democracy, if it were not restored to its former pride of place.

By the by, Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio, as to what has become of his proposition to re-establish this sub-Treasury scheme? At an early day of the session, he introduced a resolution instructing the committee to report a bill for that purpose. This resolution was adopted by the House by a vote of nearly two to one, all the party going for it. Two or three months have elapsed, and yet we have no report. Is it not to be brought forward? [Mr. Duncan here interposed, and said it would.] I have no doubt the gentleman expects it to be brought up; but, sir, I have heard it suggested that the knowing ones of the party think this an injudicious move, and that the zeal of that member outran his discretion. They think, probably, that it is inexpedient for the party to show its hand on this question till after the Presidential election is over. The gentleman's party have a large majority on that committee, and I wish to know of them why they do not report? It cannot be that they have not been able to frame a bill in all this time. It was only necessary for them to copy from the statute book the old sub-Treasury act. Are they afraid that the skeleton of the dead monster will frighten the nation? Or are they only keeping it back till after the Virginia election is over? I call upon them to give us a report. It is an issue of their own making, and I am for holding them to it.

But the nation is called upon to reverse the decision of 1840, rendered against Martin Van Buren. And when the people, who gave that verdict, after a most patient investigation, ask him and his friends for new evidence on which to base that reversal, what is the reply they get from the member from Ohio, and others of the party? "Ask us for new evidence: You know that you rendered a false verdict, because you were bribed to it with British gold. Your heads were turned with Whig songs, and some of you were drunk on hard cider!" Do they really suppose that American freemen are already so much humbled as to be willing to make these degrading confessions? that they can be driven by such a course of argument either to stultify themselves, or admit that they have acted corruptly?

The member from Ohio says he endorses the complaint made this morning by a gentleman from Alabama, (Mr. Payne) that Whig songs

have been sent off through the post office. I have learned, from a source entitled to full credit, that the members of their party have, within the last week, sent off some fifty thousand copies of a single document. And what important communication, Mr. Speaker, would you suppose they are sending abroad to enlighten the nation? A pamphlet professing to give an account of Mr. Clay's duels, from the *Expositor* office, written, it is said, by Amos Kendall. This old ingrate, after having spent a life of wickedness, is, it seems, now seized with qualms of conscience, has become exceedingly righteous, and seeks to atone for his past crimes by writing and publishing libels on his former benefactor—an instrument most worthily selected for so foul a purpose. And who are the pious persons that are engaged in circulating it? Almost every individual among them is a supporter and eulogist of General Jackson—a man who not only fought more duels than Mr. Clay, but who had the misfortune on one occasion at least, to kill his antagonist. They number among their prominent men in Congress more than one individual who has been concerned in duels. Well may we tremble for the morals of the country when such Pharisees become our teachers of virtue and religion. They say, I am told, that it will not do to circulate these things at the South, but they are sent by thousands to Connecticut, a land of “steady habits.” Have they so low an opinion of the sagacity of the people there as to suppose that by such a shallow artifice, such barefaced hypocrisy, they can divert their attention from the great issues involved in the coming elections?

The gentleman laments that the Whigs will not show their hands, and that he cannot find out what their principles are. He undertakes to make speeches to enlighten the country on political matters, and not know what are the principles of the Whig party! Why, sir, there is hardly a man in my district who could not inform him fully on this point. After this confession on his part I am not surprised that he should have thrown out so many absurd doctrines. In order that he may no longer wander in Egyptian darkness, I will endeavor to inform him as to some of the leading Whig principles: First, as to mere matters of policy, we are generally in favor of a tariff, such as I have indicated already. With respect to the public lands, we are averse to seeing their proceeds go to support the ordinary expenses of this government; and we are utterly opposed to that policy which finds so much favor with the gentleman's party—that is, a surrender of them to the States in which they lie; but we desire to see their proceeds distributed among all the States, to relieve some of them from heavy taxation; to enable them to maintain their honor by discharging the debts they have already incurred, and to aid all of them in diffusing the benefits of education generally among their citizens. We also hold it to be the duty of the government to furnish a sound currency of uniform value throughout the Union, by means of a well-regulated and closely guarded national institution, which may, on the one hand, relieve us from the evils of an exclusively metallic currency, and on the other protect us from the mischiefs of a fictitious, bloated paper currency, of unequal value in different sections, created by a multitude of ill-managed, unsound, local banks. We are, as a party,

opposed to such a profligate system of expenditures as the country witnessed under Martin Van Buren's administration, and in favor of holding public officers to strict accountability. Upon all these questions of policy the Whigs are united, with very few exceptions. But there are some great cardinal principles which we cherish with entire unanimity, and which I will attempt briefly to unfold. The gentleman declared that ours was the Federal party. Does he not know that James Buchanan, the individual he eulogizes so highly, and who was but lately held up as a candidate for the Presidency in several States by his party, was an ultra Federalist, according to his own admission, until very lately? Is he not aware that a countless number of the members of his party formerly belonged to the old Federal ranks? Perhaps he may say that these individuals have changed their views, and that this circumstance is not a conclusive test. So be it, then. But I will not take the declarations of him and his party as affording any evidence of their Democracy. No one in common life would determine the principles of a man simply by his professions, but he would look to conduct, as furnishing a much surer test. What were the principles of the old Federal party in the year 1800? They thought the executive branch of the government in that day too weak, and endeavored to enlarge the powers of the President. This was supposed to be their cardinal principle, and they sought to strengthen the President and diminish the privileges of the people. Some of the means they used to effect this object were the sedition law, the increase of the army and navy, and an enlargement of the expenditures of the government, so as to increase the patronage of the President, and thus indirectly add to his power. The Republicans of that day, believing that the government had already power enough, resisted these measures.

The contest, therefore, rested on the same principles on which was based the struggle between the Whig and Tory parties in England. There the Tories have ever been found on the side of the Crown, struggling to increase its prerogatives and enlarge its powers, so as gradually, unless resisted, to convert the government into a despotism. But the Whigs have ever been the champions of popular rights, and have incessantly labored to keep within proper bounds, and reduce if possible, the overgrown monarchical power in that country. Where, then, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Ohio stand? Where is his party, tried by this standard? The immense expenditures of Mr. Van Buren's administration, its corrupting patronage, its sub-Treasury, the army bill—I need not mention them, for they will start up of themselves before your mind. All these are defended and sustained by our adversaries, because they tend to increase the power of the executive branch of the government. On this account, they are pleased with the frequent exercise of the veto power, in contempt of the will of the people. If the President, seeing that a bill will be passed by a majority of two-thirds in spite of his veto, should refuse to return it to Congress, and thus prevent their passing it into a law, such an act of tyranny is applauded by them. If he should corruptly refuse to carry into execution a law already made,

he is defended and greatly eulogized. They desire to see a President eligible a second time to office. When, therefore, he is once in power, if he be a selfish and unprincipled man, instead of discharging his official duties, his whole attention is directed to the securing of his reelection. Having the appointment of more than fifty thousand officers, he selects his friends for office, and threatens with removal all who do not electioneer for him. This system was brought into the administration of the Federal government by Mr. Van Buren, when he became Secretary of State. He and his friends justify it by saying, that the offices of the country are spoils, which belong to the victor party. The tendency of this system is to convert the office-holders of the country into a mercenary army of electioneers, commanded by the President. So sensible was Mr. Jefferson of the mischief likely to result from this condition of things, that he published a circular-letter forbidding the officers of government on pain of dismissal from office, to interfere, except by simply voting, in any manner in the elections. General Harrison did the same thing, as soon as he came into the Presidential chair. But Mr. Van Buren not only requires them to take part in his favor, but, as the reports of the investigating committees of this House prove, they were compelled, by a threat of dismissal from office, to pay in proportion to the salary of each, a tax to raise a fund for electioneering purposes. The adoption of this system accounts for the large number of defaulters in Mr. Van Buren's time. Officers were not selected because they were "honest and capable," as Mr. Jefferson advised, but because they had rendered the party service. Hence, after it was known that they were taking money from the public Treasury, as the published correspondence of Levi Woodbury, the then Secretary of the Treasury, shows, they were still retained in office, in some instances, because they had extensive connections, and were influential in carrying the elections.

While they have been supporting all these measures, so corrupting and monarchical in their tendency, the gentleman and his party, with a view of diverting public attention from their acts, and deceiving the careless and ignorant, have been making loud and unceasing professions of Republicanism and Democracy, therein verifying the prediction of Mr. Jefferson, that the next effort of those who maintained the old Federal doctrines to get into power would be made after they had stolen our name. Whatever was most pernicious among the doctrines of the old Federal party they have adopted, without its openness and honesty of purpose. Under their system, the executive power is advancing with rapid strides, the public morals are daily becoming more and more corrupt, and, unless it be arrested, our liberties will be lost. Sir, we have nothing to fear from foreign force. No free government was ever destroyed in this way. As long as they are animated by a proper spirit, the feeblest nations have been able to repel invasion. The little States of Greece, while they remained virtuous and ardent lovers of liberty, were an overmatch for all Asia. They afterwards fell a prey to the petty kingdom of Macedon. But it was not until the gold of Philip had penetrated into the heart of Greece, that his steel could triumph on the fatal field of Cheronea.

To resist the downward tendency of things, the great Whig party are united to a man now, as they have ever been, against the extension of executive power. As a means of effecting its reduction to proper limits, they are for a single Presidential term, for the modification of the veto power, for the separation of the purse and the sword, for the reduction of patronage, for the non-interference of government officers in elections, and for the rigid supervision of all executive officers by Congress.

We have been taught, however, by bitter experience, that principles, however good, will not execute themselves. There is a man whose whole life has connected him with these great principles. For nearly forty years his time and talents have been devoted, in our legislative halls, to their propagation. Once, too, in an executive station he had an opportunity, to some extent, of testing his sincerity, and his conduct there was in accordance with his declarations elsewhere. I may be pardoned for saying that the administration with which he was connected as Secretary of State deserves to hold the highest place in public estimation, when considered with reference to its rigid economy in expenditure, its freedom from all usurpation of power, all attempts to exercise its patronage improperly, and total abstinence from proscription for opinion's sake. The individual to whom I allude filled a large space in the public eye during the last war with Great Britain. There was a peace party in that day, such as the gentleman from Ohio spoke of, and that party selected De Witt Clinton as its candidate for the Presidency, against James Madison, the war candidate; and Martin Van Buren, the gentleman's favorite, was an active and most zealous supporter of Clinton. He to whom I allude was not of this party. On the contrary, he was the most ardent advocate of that war, and proclaimed, in trumpet tones, that sooner than submit to British wrongs, he would prefer to see the American people expire in a common struggle for "free trade and sailors' rights." Not such free trade as some advocate in our day, the allowing foreigners to sell their productions here without being obliged to pay duties, while their governments impose burdens on us. No, sir; it was for the privilege of carrying our own goods in our own ships across the ocean, without having those ships seized, searched and plundered, and our seamen impressed into the British navy. Sir, being the most active of all our public men, he had originated more great measures than all others of his time. Often were they deemed bold, hazardous and inexpedient by his compeers, but his eagle-eyed sagacity, and enlarged patriotism did not fail to select that course which the matured judgment of the nation approved. Sometimes he stood almost alone; yet when his position has seemed most critical, such has been the fertility of his invention and the extent of his resources, that he has then ever achieved the greatest triumphs.

For instances, let me refer you to his course in relation to the acknowledgment of South American independence, to the origin of the land distribution scheme, to his conduct in relation to our difficulties with France, and to the introduction of the compromise bill in 1833. I will advert, more particularly, to one event of his life, which has by

some been thought rash, because there was once a diversity of opinion in relation to it, and because it illustrates, in my view, same traits in his character. He was one of the five commissioners at Ghent, who closed the war with England by treaty. The British commissioners insisted that we should cede to Great Britain the right to the free navigation of the Mississippi river. After much argument, a majority of our commissioners all highly patriotic individuals, determined to concede the demand. He, thereupon, with a full knowledge of the fact that Great Britain, having just terminated her war successfully with Napoleon, was prepared to turn all her arms against us, declared that he would affix his name to no such treaty, and that he would take upon himself the sole responsibility of defeating it and continuing the war. Circumstances did not render this course necessary on his part, but no one doubted that he would, if it had been necessary, have executed this determination. Was this rashness on his part? Great Britain allowed us no such privilege on her rivers. He placed a high estimate on the value of national character; he felt that, to protect it from the slightest shade, it was well to expend much toil and treasure, and the lives of brave men; and he knew that such a provision would, by the world, be regarded as an acknowledgment on our part of a superiority which Great Britain had not been able to obtain in a war of more than two years. Our brave soldiers and seamen had successfully maintained our national honor on land and on the ocean, against the red cross of England, and he could not think of breaking their spirits by any concession of superiority to her. How would the news of such a treaty have been received by them? What would have been the feelings of Harrison, who captured Upper Canada from England? What those of Scott, Ripley, Brown, Perry and McDonough? What would Jackson have said, who was then defending the Mississippi itself? How would this have fallen on the ear of Decatur, that "Bayard of the ocean," as he was bearing your flag over the seas? Was this rashness on the part of that distinguished individual? If so, it was like the rashness of Leonidas at the pass of Thermopylæ. He had been sent far in advance of the rest of his countrymen, to show an example, to receive the first shock of the Persian invasion, and to protect his country's territory safe from the impress of a hostile foot. And when he found that he would be overpowered by numbers and treachery, instead of retreating, he held on to that pass with a firm foothold, and won a name which time has only rendered more illustrious. Was this rashness on his part? It was the height of prudence. Leonidas knew well that the dying of his little band on that lone sea beach, in the face of the world, would be worth more to the liberties of Greece than ten thousand lives. Actions like this give a nation character, and elevate the minds of her sons to such a pitch, that they have spirit and energy to overcome all obstacles.

It is the province of a great genius, when common minds are bewildered and made dizzy by the contemplation of a chaos of dangers, to point the path to safety. It was in an emergency like this that another great Greek, Themistocles, when the allied navy was about to be separated and disbanded, by a bold stratagem brought on the sea fight at

donian phalanx, but a cup of hard cider was presented, and they went down before it.

The gentleman, I do not question, has good reason to complain of and denounce this last weapon, as many of his allies have doubtless fallen under it. I will put a question to the gentleman, the answer to which I hope he will calculate in figures. If his army of Democrats were totally defeated in 1840, by log cabins, hard cider and coon skins, used against them by one who, according to the gentleman's own declarations at that time, was an old dotard, kept in a cage, who was so great a coward that he ran away from every battle that he ever heard of, and whose most appropriate dress was a flannel petticoat, how long will that army be able to stand up against the strength and spirit of the great Whig party of this day, led on by the first man of the age? Upon what does the gentleman build his hope of success? Ah, but he says British gold was used to buy up votes. Well, sir, I perceive, from the newspapers, that money is unusually plenty in England at this time, and I have no doubt that his Democrats want it just as much now as they did four years ago. But we used log cabins; and will our forests not furnish us with materials to build them this year? Then there were coon skins in 1840. Yes, and the requisite number can be procured again. Worst of all, however, was the hard cider. I tell him it will flow like water this year, and it will become very hard to Democratic palates by next November.

To be serious, however, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the member from Ohio, that he does great injustice to his party, when he says it was thus defeated. I have no doubt but that he is extremely anxious to create the impression that nothing more serious could be brought against it, and that its overthrow was entirely owing to these means. No, sir; you might as well say that Niagara's current owes its power and rapidity to the bubbles that float on its surface. All these things were but emblems, borne upon the vast popular current. The large expenditures of that administration, its profligacy, its keeping defaulters in its bosom for years after their crimes were known, its patronage, and proscription, its army bill, its sub-treasury, giving the president the money power of the nation, and grinding the people in the dust under its hard money system, its general contempt of the will of the people, these things beat the gentleman's party, and they will beat it again. Yes, sir, they will *beat it again*. Already dismay begins to be visible in the faces of the members of the party here, and some of them are attributing the strong current against them to Mr. Van Buren's unpopularity. I have heard it suggested in some quarters that that has happened to him which frequently occurs to old horses: that, after having been once distanced, have been off the turf a long while, that he has broken down in his second training. If it be, then, true that he is off his legs, select another horse. We are not very particular as to who may be our antagonist. I regard Mr. Van Buren as a quiet, rather timid man, of little will of his own, and inclined to go with the current of his party. These features in his character make him the worst man of all, if elected. He is the instrument of an irresponsible body of

men, that always has less moderation, less fairness, and less conscience, than a single individual, whatever may be his disposition naturally, feels bound, by a regard for public opinion, to manifest. Mr. Calhoun, if elected, would be, in many respects, vastly superior. He has talents, strength of will, and pride of character, and feeling conscious that the eye of the nation was fixed on him, we should have less to dread. If, however, rumor is to be credited, he was, a few weeks since, bartered away by his partizans in Virginia, with the concurrence of some elsewhere, to Mr. Van Buren, for a share, in prospect, of the spoils of the next presidential canvass. Being strongly tempted by the glittering bait, it seems they came to the conclusion that they could make the most of him by such a sale. In contemplating these individuals, one is irresistibly forced to think of the Swiss soldiers of the middle ages, who changed sides as often as a better bid was offered.

By means of the caucus system, the partisans of Mr. Van Buren have killed off all the other prominent men of the party, and it is now too late to select another leader. When we are charging you at the point of the bayonet, you will have no time to change commanders. If you think you can, *try it*. We care not who is your leader; we shall have the same principles and the same men to contend against, and we shall be at you far more easily than we did before. The nation, relieved from your disastrous measures, and aided by a partial adoption of ours, is recovering from its former ruinous condition, and it *never will* consent to come under your dominion again. Talk of the campaign of 1840, as if it had exhausted our energies! Our ancestors struggled through seven campaigns, to achieve our independence, and we, their descendants, taught that eternal vigilance is the *price of liberty*, can, if necessary, go through seventy more campaigns like that of 1840. But we are taunted, from time to time, with our small numbers on this floor. Sir, the organization of this House affords no index of the popular sentiment of the nation. North Carolina is represented by a majority of Democrats here; but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the Whig majority in my district is large enough, if it had been distributed over the State at the last election, to have given us an unanimous representation on this floor. And, still, there is another district in North Carolina stronger even in Whigism than the one I am so proud to represent. Though in this House we are but as one man, out of it we are a thousand. The bone and sinew of the country, the strength and spirit of the nation are with us. We have the gray-haired veteran to plan, the generous youth to execute, and the smiles of the fair ladies to cheer us on; and shall we not conquer? The noble banner we have raised we shall maintain at all hazards. We shall bear it high above the tumult, above the dust, and out of danger. And, with the favor of Providence, under its folds we shall win another victory not less brilliant and glorious than that of 1840, and I trust far richer in its benefits to the country.

NOTE.

The course of the Whigs on this bill of Duncan's shows with how little wisdom men often act. Because Duncan, a Democrat, offered it, the Whigs resisted and defeated it. Had it then been passed, it is almost certain that

Mr. Clay would have been elected. The States at that time voted on various days as each one chose to do, and it so happened that several of those adverse to Mr. Clay voted early and thus tended to weaken him. The great shout raised by the anxious multitude assembled at the wharf in New York, when it was announced by the passengers on the deck of the Philadelphia boat just arriving, that Pennsylvania had gone for Polk, was believed to have had a decided effect on the election which soon occurred in New York. After having been so terribly wounded, the Whigs, as men usually do after being seriously hurt, acquiesced in the proposition to establish an uniform day for the Presidential election throughout the United States.

SPEECH

ON THE CAUSES OF MR. CLAY'S DEFEAT, DELIVERED IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 6, 1845.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall leave it to those who desire it to discuss the constitutionality or expediency of the proposed annexation of Texas. It is not expected by anybody that any practical result, in the way of legislation, is to grow out of these proceedings. Doubtless you may be able, as was suggested the other day by the gentleman from South Carolina, to pass an abstract resolution, after the fashion of your Baltimore Convention, declaring that Texas ought to be annexed as soon as practicable. Your agitation of the matter is intended solely to produce capital to operate on our elections at the South during the present year, and I shall, therefore, meet the question on its real and not its ostensible merits.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, (Mr. C. J. Ingersoll,) who opened the debate, stated that there had been a very decided manifestation of popular opinion in favor of the annexation, and was pleased to refer to the late Presidential election as furnishing evidence of it. The gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. Douglass,) who immediately preceded me in the debate, declared, with great vehemence, that the popular verdict had been recorded in favor of the measure, and that if those who were now on this floor failed to carry out the wishes of the people, they would be swept away by a torrent of public indignation, and men be sent in their places who were more faithful. If all this were true, sir, it would furnish a strong argument in favor of the measure, because, in a representative Republic, like ours, popular opinion is of the greatest consequence. I shall endeavor to show, however, that these gentlemen are totally mistaken in these views; but to do so will oblige me to examine a good deal in detail the causes which contributed to produce the result exhibited in that election.

I must, in the first place, however, ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes, while I advert to a matter not directly connected with this subject.

At the last session, when a proposition to repeal the twenty-fifth rule was under consideration, it will be remembered that the debate was pro-

longed for nearly three months, and as each speech was concluded, more than twenty chivalric gentlemen sprang to their feet and struggled for an opportunity to manifest their ardor in behalf of Southern rights. And it was only, sir, by resorting to the previous question that we were able to terminate the debate before the close of the session.

On the first day of the present session, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) gave notice that he would on to-morrow introduce a proposition to abolish the rule. Thereupon the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Dromgoole) likewise gave notice that he would object to the reception of the resolution, because it would be out of order. On the succeeding day, the gentleman from Massachusetts, in accordance with his promise, offered his resolution to rescind the rule, but the gentleman from Virginia, though in his place, greatly to the surprise of everybody, made no objection to its introduction. If that gentleman, or any other member, had objected to its reception, it could only have been gotten in by a suspension of the rules, and it was well known that a vote of two-thirds could not have been obtained for that purpose. The proposition came in without a word of objection from any quarter. Thereupon, a gentleman from Mississippi, acting under the old dispensation of Democracy, not having, I presume, from his location in the far Southwest, seen the new revelation of light in the Northeast, moved to lay the resolution on the table. A vote was taken by yeas and nays, and his motion was lost by a decided majority, making it evident that the rule would be repealed. The Speaker stated the question to be on the adoption of the resolution to rescind the rule. The previous question had not been ordered, and the matter was, therefore, open for debate. I looked around to see what bold champion of the South would first sound the tocsin of alarm. There was a full array of the chivalry around. There in his seat on my right was the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Rhett,) who at the last session declared, with so much eloquence and zeal, that a repeal of the rule would be a virtual dissolution of the Union.

There sat my colleague, (Mr. Saunders,) who went off on this matter with a force that sent him during the past summer over the entire State of North Carolina, declaiming against the reception of abolition petitions. There, too, were the gentlemen from Georgia and other States, who vied with each other in their denunciation of all those who did not sustain the rule. There all of these gentlemen sat, quiet and mute, as though nothing unusual was taking place, and saw, with much seeming unconcern, their favorite rule killed off by a large majority. There was no burst of indignation; no exclamation to the South, "Samson, the Philistines be upon thee!" Not even the note of a goose, to give warning of the irruption of the Gauls. Were they asleep, like the Roman sentinels of the olden time? No, no, sir; they were awake, but they were false watchmen of the South—traitor sentinels! I have a right so to call them; for, in denouncing me at the last session, some of them declared that any man who did not sustain the rule by all proper means was a renegade and a traitor to the Southern States. According to the form of the logicians, the proposition would be as follows: any Southern man who does not use his efforts to preserve the rule is a renegade traitor. They were Southern men, and might have preserved the rule by objec-

tion at the proper time, but would not do it. Therefore, they are renegade traitors. *Quod erat demonstrandum*, as the sophomores say.

How are we, Mr. Chairman, to account for the extraordinary change in the conduct of gentlemen since the Presidential election? And I may also ask, why is it that Leavitt, the Abolition editor, who was refused at the last session a seat among the reporters of the House, is now the occupant of one of the best positions in the Hall? I told you all at the last session that this twenty-fifth rule was a humbug, getting to be so well understood that it would deceive nobody much longer, and must soon be abandoned by its authors. Will gentlemen come out frankly and admit that all their parade at the last session was a mere humbug—one of the most barefaced political frauds ever attempted to be played off for party purposes? If they will not admit this—if they still insist that the rule is of any value, why did they give it up without a struggle? Was it done as compensation to their abolition allies in the North, by whose aid they carried the great States of New York and Pennsylvania, and thereby elected Mr. Polk? I do not wish gentlemen to evade this matter by their silence. If the rule was worthless, why the “sound and fury” of last session? If valuable, for what consideration did they surrender it, except that just stated? They must take one horn of the dilemma. They cannot escape from it.

Ah! I beg pardon, Mr. Chairman; there is still a third mode by which a part of these gentlemen may get out of this difficulty. Some of them may perhaps excuse themselves by saying, if they had grumbled about this matter they might have been expelled from the Democratic party, and thus lost all share of the spoils to be distributed from and after the fourth of March next. Taking this view of the case, sir, I frankly admit that these gentlemen deserve the sympathy of this House and of the country. Their fate, in being compelled to make such a submission, is peculiarly hard, when it is remembered from what quarter the principle of this rule was originally derived. Mr. Senator Benton did great injustice to John C. Calhoun, when he said, if common rumor be true, that the same John C. Calhoun, so far from being a statesman, had “never invented even a *humbug*.” The fact cannot be disputed that John C. Calhoun was the first to take “the very highest ground for the South;” the prime origin-

* It is due to the Speaker to state that he declared subsequently that he had not assigned to Mr. Leavitt, the Abolition reporter, any seat in the Hall, but inasmuch as there were a great number of applicants for reporter's seats, he had not yet completed the arrangements and allotted the seats among them; and, until his assignment had been completed, his orders had been not to prevent any reporter from entering the Hall, and occupying temporarily one of the seats. The rule of the House, No. 19, is in the following words: “No person shall be allowed the privilege of the Hall under the character of stenographer without a written permission from the Speaker, specifying the part of the Hall assigned to him, and no reporter or stenographer shall be admitted under the rules of the House, unless such reporter or stenographer shall state in writing for what paper or papers he is employed to report.” As this rule can only be changed by the House itself, and as the reporter in question occupied the seat for some weeks, I presumed, in common with other members who remarked on the transaction, that he remained by express permission of the Speaker, and not that there had been a suspension of a standing rule of the House by the Speaker for so long a period.

ator of the policy of objecting to the reception of petitions, of which the twenty-fifth rule is parcel. Hard, then, is the necessity which compels the peculiar followers of that gentleman to make a burnt offering of the first and only offspring of their idol. Considering, however, the object for which the sacrifice was made, it is to be hoped that they will derive as much consolation as did Capt. Dalgetty, who, when mourning the loss of his old war-horse on a battle-field, remembered that he could convert the hide of the dead animal into a pair of breeches. John C. Calhoun's only humbug converted into breeches for his followers!*

Judging from the action of the House on this subject, what is to become of the repeal of the tariff? I can tell you, sir. If James K. Polk will give to a few individuals that I could name such offices as they desire, he will thereby effect such a modification of the tariff as to render it acceptable in the main to the chivalric majority of the State of South Carolina. Should these persons, however, fail to get such a portion of the spoils as they consider their due, viz: the lion's share, then the tariff will be found so intolerably oppressive that human nature cannot bear it, and must be nullified. Be not deceived, sir, by all the declamation which we hear from time to time; for all this is merely thrown out to frighten Mr. Polk and his Northern friends into a good compromise with respect to the distribution of the offices. Can this be accomplished without beggaring the other sections of the party? There are not places enough in the gift of the Executive to satisfy the countless thousands of greedy office seekers. This consideration forces upon my mind the great danger which awaits your party, and, as a frank benevolent Whig, I warn you of it.

Sir, it is a common remark that the members of this so-called Democratic party, however they may take opposite sides on measures of policy, never split in their votes, but always make a common struggle on election day. This is owing to the fact which I had occasion to state at the last session, that this party is "held together solely by the cohesive power of public plunder;" and, therefore, whenever they are making a struggle to get into power, it is a part of their general system of tactics that each segment of the party should adopt that side of any question that is strongest at home, and thereby increase their chance of carrying the election. Though not yet generally known throughout the country, yet the matter is so well understood here that it seldom excites a remark, though every week furnishes conclusive evidence on the point. For example: A gentleman from Pennsylvania some time since charged the Whigs with being less friendly to protective tariff than the Democrats. Immediately after him rose a gentleman from Alabama, who declaimed furiously against the oppression of the tariff of 1842, taking no notice of the gentleman who was up just before him, but assailing

* A story is told, by Paulding, I think, of an individual who applied to Mr. Van Buren for the office of Secretary of State, but was told that it had already been promised to another. He then continued asking for various offices, in a descending scale, until he came to the lowest, and was told that the office in each instance had been already promised to some one else. "Then, sir," said he to the President, "as I am in a very needy condition, could you not give me a pair of old breeches?"

furiously some unlucky Whig who may have taken part in the debate. Says the gentleman from Pennsylvania: "Mr. Clay and the Whigs are for reducing the present duties on iron and coal, and prostrating the great interests of Pennsylvania." The gentleman from Alabama shouts aloud: "The duties on iron and coal, imposed by the present Whig tariff, are so oppressive that they cannot be borne, but shall be resisted." So far, however, are these gentlemen from finding fault with each other, that each of them, by his manner at least, seems to say to the other: "God speed you, brother; you are working bravely for Democracy." As the speech of each of them is intended for home consumption, it contains no allusion to the remarks of the other; and, by consequence, the constituent at the North sees from the speech of his representative that the Whig party is opposed to the protection of home industry, and to the existing tariff; while the planter of the South is driven to madness by learning, in a similar manner, how much he is oppressed by the present Whig tariff. However, therefore, the members of this party may differ about *measures*, they do not split in their votes on election day, and of course they act together as long as they are out of power. But, sir, very different is their condition when in power. I have already indicated that they are held together solely by the desire of office, and as there are not in the Government places enough for all, there will soon be a real quarrel, and the disappointed will vote against you. The only connecting tie being dissolved, the party will go to pieces. This, sir, is the rock on which you are destined to split. Though a political adversary, I warn you of the danger; but I frankly admit, sir, that I do not believe you will be able to profit by my advice.

When the sub-Treasury bill was under consideration some time since, it will be remembered that in the very short debate which was allowed on it, a very wide range was taken by some of the speakers. As I was not on that occasion permitted to occupy the floor, I may, I trust without impropriety, advert to some things that were said then. I do not propose, however, to discuss the merits of that measure. It was brought in by the committee at the last session and laid upon our tables, and though I in common with other Whigs called upon the majority to take it up at once, and charged them with holding it back until after the Presidential election, in order to deceive the country as to their real intentions, yet it all availed nothing, and it was permitted to sleep quietly on our tables till the close of that session. And when, during the past summer, we charged the party with designing to pass this measure again as soon as they had the power to effect it, yet it was, as if by common consent, stoutly denied by their partisans all over the country. They affirmed that this measure, having been condemned by the American people in 1840, had been abandoned, and, as a proof if it, referred to the fact that, with an immense majority in the House, the party refused to pass it. Now, however, the election being over, just as I had occasion to predict perhaps fifty times in the political debates of the past year, this very bill is taken up before any other matter of importance, and in a few hours forced through the House, and passed under the gag of the previous question. It is proclaimed that the people have decided in its favor at the late election; and we are told, with that insolence which the large majority here has inspired, that we Whigs ought to sit mute

and make no objection to its passage. So far is it from being true that the people, by their late vote, have decided in its favor, I venture to affirm that if the party had dared to pass it last spring, and thus directly made an issue on it, the result of the election would have been different. The country understands this matter too well. It is known to be a measure which will place in the hands of the President the money power of the country, and which would, in the progress of a few years, convert the government into a practical despotism.

I propose now, Mr. Chairman, to follow the example of some of the debaters who have discussed the issues involved in the late election, and the effect of the popular verdict. At the termination of the late session of Congress, when I left this city, though I was sanguine as to the general result, I knew that we were to be hardly pressed at the South. James K. Polk, the nominee of our opponents, was understood to be, and had always been, opposed to any other than a mere revenue tariff, and was avowedly in favor of the immediate annexation of Texas. Though I knew that the position of the Whig party was right on both these questions yet, inasmuch as it had formerly been the custom of Southern politicians in the main to denounce all tariffs, and the policy even of incidental protection had rarely been advocated, I feared that the time intervening before the election was too short to enable us fully to enlighten the public mind with respect to the character of the act of 1842, and our position in relation to its policy.

There was also in many quarters of the Southern part of the Union, a strong feeling in favor of the annexation of Texas, and I also apprehended that there would hardly be time enough for the people to become fully acquainted with the terms of the proposed annexation, and to understand clearly the position of the Presidential candidates with respect to the question. Though we Whigs of the South knew that it had fallen to our lot to defend the point of greatest pressure, yet we went into the contest with a determination and a spirit worthy of the noble cause in which we were engaged, and which, but for causes that we had no reason to anticipate would have afforded a success fully equal to all our hopes.

At the North this state of things was reversed. Our candidate occupied the side of these questions that was most popular with both parties in that region, and we had a right to anticipate a gain in that quarter, equal at least to any loss that might be sustained with us. Nor did I feel any serious doubts as to the result until we saw the developments of the month of September. Then it was that the extraordinary spectacle was presented to the world of a convention of the so-called Democratic party in the State of New York, which openly, and with a degree of impudence till then unseen, in solemn form repudiated the leading principles avowed in their National Convention, and at the same time declared their determination to support its Presidential nominee. It likewise nominated for the office of Governor of that State, Silas Wright, whose views were, on both of these great questions, directly opposite to those of James K. Polk. Mr. Polk declared himself utterly opposed to the tariff of 1842, and in favor of the immediate annexation of Texas, while Silas Wright had voted *for* the tariff of 1842, and had likewise voted *against* the annexation of Texas; and these two individuals were voted for on the same ticket, in order that no man might be so silly in

future as to doubt but that the said Democratic party was held together solely by the love of office, or, in language that has now become classical, "the cohesive power of public plunder."

A similar state of things was exhibited in Pennsylvania; and I have heard Democratic members of this House speak laughingly, of seeing in that State, numberless banners with the inscription borne on them of "Polk, Dallas, and the Democratic Tariff of 1842." Yes, sir, and when the Whigs attempted to set this matter right, they were told by the honest but ignorant yeomanry of that State, that they could not believe that Mr. Polk was opposed to the tariff, because they had been assured by their leaders, the men in whom they had been accustomed to confide, that he was much more favorable to a protective tariff than was Mr. Clay. The political leaders of the party in these two States, as well as elsewhere at the North, humiliated themselves so far, as to come into the support of a man who had been forced upon them by a small, and till then, contemned minority of their own party, and whose opinions were directly the reverse of those which they themselves had publicly professed. But they did not stop here. Lest their prostitution should go unrewarded, and to secure as many accomplices in political crime as possible, they seem to have deliberately entered into a scheme of misrepresentation and fraud. To bring to the support of a man whose principles, if he had any, were hostile to the views of the great mass of their followers, they deliberately resolved to misstate the principles of that man, as if they could thus turn wrong into right, and make that true which was false. By false declarations, steadily persevered in, they deluded the ignorant, who trusted to their truth. To further their conspiracy, their candidate, worthy of his party, wrote in phrases indefinite, unmeaning, vague, ambiguous, double-faced as the responses of the old Delphic oracle. When inquiries from any quarter, whatever, were put to him which would have elicited a definite answer, he remained mute, and permitted the truth to be trampled under foot. Mr. Chairman, there are recorded many instances of individual misrepresentation, dishonor, and breaches of faith, by those who previously enjoyed the public confidence; but, sir, the history of the world affords no other instance of a total destitution of a moral sense, exhibited by so large a number of individuals, no example of fraud and falsehood on a scale so extensive. To furnish materials to the active agents, there was established in this city a mint managed by, it is not necessary for me *here* to say whom, for it is too well known to all around. That establishment worked with amazing rapidity, and threw off every variety of falsehoods. To the North, for example, it sent infamous libels on the Whig candidates, such as were supposed best calculated to array against them all the profligate factions there, especially the unprincipled Abolitionists; while to the South were directed handbills, warning the people of that section, that imminent danger was impending, and that, if the Whigs came into power, slavery would be abolished, and all the interests of the South utterly prostrated. These publications were thrown out purposely on the eve of the election, in order that they might not be contradicted. They were signed by no name, or the name of an unknown irresponsible person. If, therefore, one of them found its way to a region for which it had not been intended, its parentage was stiffly denied, and it was

affirmed and certified to be a Whig forgery. For some weeks before the election, these handbills were scattered far and wide. I wondered at their numbers, for they covered the land like the locusts of Egypt. I have since been informed that several and perhaps all of the departments of the government were constantly employed to aid the party in their distribution. One of the heads of department, I am credibly informed, franked them in packages weighing, in some instances, as much as a thousand pounds. As far as I know, however, the circulation of these things produced little impression in my own State, or in the Southern country generally. It is the custom there for men of opposite parties to debate political questions face to face before the people, and the voters thus have a better chance to ascertain the views of parties and of their candidates. It is true, that our adversaries sometimes attempted to deny Mr. Polk's views as to the sub-treasury, and other questions, but these denials were seldom successful. Sir, I never yet have met a man that I could not, in a day or two's debate, by continued question, cross-examination, and denunciation, compel to admit the truth, when I had documentary or other plain evidence to establish it. Providence seems to have denied to man the power to persist in falsehood with the same steadiness of eye and countenance, with which truth can be maintained. I doubt if Talleyrand, himself, who used to say that language was given to men to enable them to conceal their thoughts, could persevere successfully in falsehood during the whole of one of our Southern campaigns.

At the North, the mode of conducting a canvass is different. The speakers on opposite sides seldom if ever meet each other in debate. The meetings being composed of one party only, the matter thrown out goes uncontradicted alike, whether it be truth or falsehood, and the members of either party adopt the views of their own speakers. To the uninformed, however honest they may be, the best authenticated document carries no more evidence of its truth, than the libel representing both by pictures and writing, Mr. Clay hanging the three Dutchmen, which was so extensively circulated in Pennsylvania.

If this state of things continues, our constitution of government is virtually at an end. Our republican system is based upon the principle that those who exercise power here represent and carry out, under the constitution, the views of the people. But if the matter be so managed that the great mass of the voters do not and cannot ascertain the views of the candidates before them, the consequence follows, that those elected, do not in fact represent the people, and our republican form of government is virtually abolished. As a means of averting, to some extent at least, this great evil, let the practice of requiring the speakers on both sides to confront each other in debate, be generally adopted. To effect this, let there be a union of all those who desire truth to prevail, who wish to see our free constitution preserved in substance as well as in form, and who desire that the blessings of liberty should be transmitted to those who are to come after us. At any rate, I call upon every Whig to adopt this mode, publish your appointments, and challenge your opponents to meet you. If they fail to meet you, denounce them as being afraid of such investigation, because they know that the facts are against them. Persevere in this course, and they will be compelled by

public opinion, yes, by their own followers, to meet you; for there are in the hearts of our countrymen of all parties, a desire to know the truth, and a generous love of fair play.

I am now brought, Mr. Chairman, to the consideration of another most important matter in connection with the late presidential canvass. After the nominations in the spring, the Whig party held many large political meetings, at which there was much able and eloquent discussion. Our orators went through many parts of the country, and debated most successfully, the principles of the two parties. All this was well, for it secured to our standard a vast majority of the intelligent and reflecting portion of the Union. But this alone, as the event has shown, was not sufficient. Resting on the goodness of our cause, the soundness of the principles advocated by us, and the belief that the wisdom of our measures would bring a majority of the voters to the support of our candidate, we neglected that complete organization in detail which was necessary to prevent undue influence and imposition on the voters at the election.

Since the beginning of the world, regularly trained soldiers have always been able to beat raw militia. Hence, when any one nation keeps up a well-disciplined standing army, the neighboring States must adopt a similar system or be overpowered. This truth, so universally admitted with respect to military affairs, has not been generally understood in its bearings on elections in a country like ours. In every part of the Union, there are some individuals whose opinions are not so firmly fixed but what they may be changed at or about the time of the election. This may be brought about in various ways. A man, naturally irresolute or unstable in his purposes, may be persuaded; one not informed as to the principles and conduct of the candidates, may be deceived by artful misrepresentation; the dishonest are liable to be biased by improper influences. These classes constitute what is sometimes denominated the floating vote, that is, a vote which is liable to be easily changed from one party to another. It is, doubtless, largest in the great cities, and varies considerably in different sections. But everywhere there are those who, by persuasion, misrepresentation, fraud, or other means, may be induced to vote differently from what they intended, a short time previous to the election. The number of these individuals is sufficiently large to decide the result in all closely contested elections. Take as an example the great State of New York in the late presidential election. Taking the whole State over, it will not be questioned by any one that there is a much larger proportion than the one hundred and seventy-fifth part of the voters there, whose views on political matters were not so fixed, as to prevent their being influenced at the time of the election. Though of course not unaware of this condition of things to some extent in all the States, yet the Whig party has in the main relied on the justness of its cause, and the voluntary exertions of its individual members to counteract improper influences. Our adversaries, however, have been practicing on a very different system. They have acquired a skill and discipline in party tactics unknown to any other faction that has existed in this country. Whether this system was perfected in the State of New York, and brought into the administration of the Federal government by Mr. Van Buren, as some suppose, I shall not now stop to inquire.

As at present organized, the so-called Democratic party, though it allows the individuals composing it to profess such opinions on all measures of legislative policy as they may think it most advantageous to adopt, yet it requires the utmost fidelity in all party manœuvres, especially in elections. To stimulate this feeling, the offices are promised to those, who may have rendered the party the most efficient service. Each member is required to stand by his party at all hazards, though in so doing he should act in opposition to the best interests of the country. In turn, the party will stand by him, and protect him from the consequences of any crime he may commit, provided it be done for the benefit of the party. A thousand instances might be given, to establish the truth of this conclusion. I will refer, however, only to a single one, of recent occurrence in my own State. When our Legislature, now in session, assembled, there was a tie between the parties in the Senate. Each party was of course desirous of electing a Speaker and other officers. According to the old and well-settled law of the State, each member elect was bound to produce, before his qualification, the certificate of the sheriff of his having been elected. But one who claimed to be a Democratic senator, was not provided with such a certificate, and the fact became known through the indiscretion of those friends, that he consulted in his dilemma. When the time came for the opening of the first day's session, this individual much to the surprise of his political adversaries at least, presented a forged certificate in the usual form, was qualified as a Senator, and took his seat. It was five days before the body was organized by the election of a Speaker, &c. A committee was raised to investigate the affair. They, upon evidence of the most conclusive character, reported that the certificate had been forged either by the Senator or by his procurement, and knowingly used by him to impose on the Senate, and recommended his expulsion. The vote of the Senate was unanimous on the first resolution, declaring the certificate a forgery; but upon the second, declaring that he ought to be expelled, every member of his party voted in the negative, thereby saying that, though he had committed forgery, he was not in their opinion unworthy to *sit with them*. After his expulsion by the casting vote of the Whig Speaker, his party, taking advantage of the accidental absence of two or three Whigs, within a few days moved and carried a proposition to strike from the journals the report, proceedings, &c., that had taken place, with a view of inserting in their stead the speech of his counsel made in his defence at the bar of the Senate. A stranger would perhaps be surprised to learn that many of these individuals, in the relations of private life, are esteemed honest and honorable men. Nothing could show more conclusively their devotion to their party, than that they should be thus able to overcome their natural aversion to crime, and thus endeavor to countenance and protect the criminal, because that crime had been committed for the benefit of the party. Sir, it gives me no pleasure to refer to this occurrence. We formerly flattered ourselves that however mischievous locofocoism might become in other sections, there was in North Carolina and other parts of the South a regard for public opinion, and a feeling of personal honor among its leading members, which would keep it somewhat in the bounds of decency. But it is a tree which bears the same fruit in every climate. Its late exhibitions will arouse the

indignation of the virtuous yeomanry of the Old North State. But, sir, I shall pursue this illustration no further. I wished simply to call your attention to the nature of the bond which connects this so-called Democratic party. To show the extent to which its organization has been carried, I refer you to the secret "Circular from the Executive Committee of the Democratic Association of Washington city," issued last September. I would read the whole of it, if I did not know that its contents were well understood by most, if not all on this floor. Its first four sections as you know, provide for the organization of a Democratic Association, by whatever name they choose to call it, in every "county, city, ward, town, and village throughout the Union;" the appointment of executive committees, captains, lieutenants, and Democratic minute-men—that is, "men who are willing to serve the Democracy at a minute's warning." Their first class of duties is prescribed in sections five and six, in the following words—

"5. That the captain and lieutenants, with such minute-men as may be detailed for the service, proceed forthwith to make out two lists—one of all voters in the company bounds, designating the Democrats, Whigs and the Abolitionists, putting into a separate column, headed "doubtful," the names of all whose opinions are unknown, and all of every party who are easily managed in their opinion or conduct; the other list to embrace all minors approaching maturity, and all men not entitled to vote."

"6. That a copy of these lists be furnished to the Executive Committee of each Democratic Association within the election precinct."

Section seven directs these officers and minute-men to circulate all papers that may influence the doubtful men. Section eight makes it the duty of the minute men to get all the doubtful men to their meetings. Sections nine, ten, eleven and twelve, are as follows:

"9. That the captain of the Democratic minute-men appoint a time and place of rendezvous, early on the first morning of election, and detail minute-men to wait upon, and if possible bring with them every doubtful voter within the company bounds."

"10. That, if practicable, some suitable refreshments be provided for the company at the place of rendezvous, and their ardor kindled by patriotic conversation; that each man be furnished with a ticket with the names of the Democratic electors; that it be impressed upon them that the *first great business of the day is to give their votes*; that they are expected and required to march to the polls in a body, and in perfect silence; to avail themselves of the first opportunity to vote, and *never separate until every member of the company has voted*.

"11. That if any Democrat be absent from the rendezvous, the captain despatch a minute-man forthwith to bring him to the polls.

"12. That the captains and lieutenants provide beforehand means for conveyance for such Democrats as cannot otherwise get to the polls."

Without going further with this matter, Mr. Chairman, I have read enough to afford an accurate idea of this system of organization. That it would be most effective in practice is obvious, when it is remembered that there are in every country some who, from indecision of character, may be persuaded—some who, from honest credulity and

want of political knowledge, can be imposed upon by artfully-framed documents or verbal misrepresentation; while others may be overcome by the influence of what are called "refreshments" or other means. This or some similar plan of organization was adopted in many parts of the country. In the State of Tennessee, as I have been informed, by what I regard as first-rate *democratic* authority, the following was the mode relied on: There are about fifteen hundred civil districts in that State, in each of which there is a precinct for voting. In each one of these districts the Democratic party selected five individuals, who were, by their combined exertions prior to and on the election day, to endeavor to change two voters in each district, which in the whole State would amount to three thousand, and, taken from the Whig to the Democratic side, would make a difference of six thousand in the result. By this means they hoped to overcome the majority of four thousand which had been cast against Mr. Polk the year previous. That this scheme failed is solely owing to the fact that in that State the Whigs were more zealous, more active, and better organized than they were in the other States. Nothing given such confidence and spirit to an individual, as the knowledge that his efforts will be seconded and sustained by all of the members of his party. It is a similar thought which gives courage to a soldier going into battle in the ranks of veterans, whom he knows and confides in, that he would **not** feel in the midst of a body of raw militia.

The leading members of the Democratic party, being in the late canvass well aware that the system of Whig policy was approved by a majority of the people of the Union, and that their nominee had also a vast personal superiority in the estimation of every body over Mr. Polk, felt that the issue, if determined with respect either to measures or men, would be decided against them. They therefore called into exercise to the fullest extent their system of party organization, to obtain as many votes as possible for their candidate, and showed themselves devoid of all scruples as to the mode in which these votes were to be procured.

But, Mr. Chairman, our opponents did not content themselves with merely obtaining the votes of individuals. They also courted and won over all the various smaller factions of the Union. It is the natural tendency of these in every country to array themselves against the strongest party. The Whig party was, as all will concede, the stronger, and it stood firmly on well known and fixed principles. With these principles none of the factions of the country harmonized. But the Democratic party avowedly stood on no general system of principles with respect to the administration of the government. It contained in its body men who professed opposite opinions on every political question. Its broad and catholic spirit could receive in its bosom the members of every faction without obliging them to sacrifice or modify any of their professed opinions. In short, it was a fit receptacle for the fragments of all factions, and it wooed them in the manner best calculated to win.

The Abolition party had nominated as its candidate for the Presidency James G. Birney; but the Democratic party likewise afterwards

nominated him for the Legislature of Michigan. He accepted this nomination, and by that means, or perhaps by more solid appliances, he was induced to use his influence with his party in behalf of Mr. Polk. In his published letters before the election, I allude not to his spurious, but the genuine ones, he declared that, though opposed both to Mr. Clay and Mr. Polk, yet he much more deprecated the election of Mr. Clay, because, being a man of greatly superior abilities, he was always able to lead his party, and would do much more to retard and overthrow abolition principles than Mr. Polk, whom he spoke of as a man of no talent, incapable of controlling his party, and powerless as against abolition. Mr. Speaker, when I first read these letters, I saw that they were so ingeniously framed that they would have the desired effect with the Abolition party. Nay, sir; they take the precise view of the matter which a sagacious, sincere Abolitionist would. Nothing surely could be more fatal to the progress, and even existence of that faction, than the administration of a man of the lofty patriotism, splendid abilities, vast personal popularity, moderation and firmness of Henry Clay; giving, as such an administration would do, that confidence, repose, and prosperity which the country so much needs. On the contrary, all little factions vegetate and thrive under the weak, vacillating administration of a feeble man. Rightfully or wrongfully, however, as it may be deemed, it is certain that these views of Birney, and like efforts on the part of the Democratic party, had the desired effect on the mass of the Abolition party. The States of New York, Pennsylvania, and perhaps others, were carried for Mr. Polk, and, as our candid political adversaries admit, the Abolitionists have made the President.

So strong, however, sir, was the Whig party in the country that even this manœuvre would not have defeated us had it not been for other similar artifices. Nearly one hundred thousand foreigners are estimated to arrive annually in the United States; of this number a very large proportion are Roman Catholics. By means, which time does not permit me to recount, but the most insidious and unjustifiable, the Democratic party succeeded in inducing them to band themselves together and rally to the support of Mr. Polk. Some of them avowed their preference for him because his free trade policy was more favorable to the interest of the mother countries from which they came than was Mr. Clay's. Others openly proclaimed on their banners that they would not be ruled by Americans. As evidence of the sort of feeling which has been inculcated into the minds of the most ignorant of them, I may be pardoned for mentioning a little incident that occurred in the room of a friend to whom I chanced to be making a visit. While making his fire, the Irish porter inquired when Mr. Polk would come on to the city. "I am told," he added, "that he is a great friend to us poor foreigners; we elected him, and we can do most anything when we all try." Sir, had the foreign Catholics been divided in the late election, as other sects and classes generally were, Mr. Clay would have carried by a large majority the State of New York, as also the States of Pennsylvania and Louisiana, and probably some others in the Northwest. Not only did we have to contend against the influence

of foreigners here, but British gold was openly and profusely used to promote Mr. Polk's election, professedly with a view of breaking down the tariff and promoting the sale of their manufactures in this country. All the world may interfere in our domestic matters. With one hand Great Britain stimulates the abolitionism of the North, with a view of desolating the South, or forcing a dissolution of the Union; and with the other, under the influence of motives equally selfish, she seeks to array the planting and farming interest of the country against the tariff, and thereby break down the manufacturing establishments of the North. And we, as a nation, sit stupidly quiet while she foments for her own advantage our domestic dissensions.

Our political opponents, likewise, derived accidentally great advantage from the official patronage of the present administration. Usually the opponents of the acting President have, as a counterpoise to his direct influence, the advantage of holding his administration responsible before the country for its errors or crimes. But in the present instance the acts of the executive, though in heart and soul completely identified with the Democratic party, because he had not been elected by them, were, whenever it suited their purpose, disavowed. He thus occupied a position of seeming neutrality between the two parties, and was able to turn to account the power in his hands. He accordingly exerted to the utmost the power which he possessed over them, going even to the odious extent practiced in Mr. Van Buren's time, of compelling them, on pain of dismissal from office, to contribute a part of their salaries to create a fund to be used in favor of Mr. Polk's election. At three several assessments of one per cent. each of salary in the custom house, \$15,000 is said to have been raised. One of the officers there, John Orser, is said to have presented to the Empire Club several hundred hickory clubs, to enable them to beat away from the polls the Whig voters, for which laudable act he seems to have received a vote of thanks from said Empire Club.

To ascertain the extent of this influence on the whole country is not easy, but the number of office-holders in the State of New York alone is such as to account for a greater number of votes than Mr. Polk's actual majority there.

From Mr. Clay's character, political experience, and associations, it was known that his selections for office would be made from the best men in the country. All of the old defaulters, therefore, all mere needy adventurers, without character to support their claims for office, having nothing to hope from him, naturally arrayed themselves on the other side.

Without doubt, too, they are right, to some extent, who attach weight to another influence, not properly political, to-wit: that the gambling portion of the community finding, at the beginning of the canvass, that they could not get persons to bet against Mr. Clay, did so themselves, with large odds in their favor, and afterwards devoted a portion of the many millions staked to effect the result desired by them.

Yet, with all the acquisitions and advantages which I have been recounting, our adversaries were too prudent to rest secure. They knew that the constitution had provided no mode by which the fair-

ness of a presidential election could be contested; no means of purging the polls of illegal votes. If a vote were received by the inspectors of the election at each precinct, and by them returned, it mattered not whether the person professing to give it were qualified to vote or not at that place. They, therefore, by means of the system of organization already described, deliberately formed a widely extended plan for the purpose of procuring a sufficient number of illegal votes to carry States enough to secure the election of Mr. Polk. Their first demonstration seems to have been made in the city of Baltimore in the October election. There it was that they gave a vote so much larger than was ever polled at any preceding election, as to satisfy all persons that fraud had been practiced. Investigations since then have made it manifest that the increased vote was owing, not only to the fact that many persons voted not authorized at all to vote there, but that likewise those qualified had, in some instances, voted two, three, or more times at different precincts in the city. About fifty persons have already been convicted and sentenced to punishment for this offence by the courts, not one of whom is a Whig, though they have been pardoned from time to time by the Democratic Governor there. The fraud here was but the precursor of what followed.

The great State of New York claims the first notice. During the past year there were naturalized there not less than seven thousand foreigners. This was effected entirely by the Democratic party, the Whigs having no office provided for that purpose, because as I learn, there is not one of these foreigners out of fifty who will vote the Whig ticket. Of this large number a great proportion, not having been five years in the country, could not be legally naturalized, and their votes, therefore, when given, were illegal.

Men who had not been one month in the country from the penitentiaries of Europe, unacquainted even with the language in which they were sworn, voted for what they knew not.

But the principal frauds were practised by what is called double voting. The city of New York was the great theatre where this was consummated. As the Empire Club bore such a prominent part in these transactions, I must devote a remark or two to it. It was organized in July last, and it consisted of gamblers, pickpockets, droppers, thimble-riggers, burners, and the like, and its association seems to have been then mainly for the purpose of carrying on successfully these and similar trades. Most of its members had been repeatedly indicted for crimes. Its general character, however, may be sufficiently inferred from that of some of its officers. Its president was Isaiah Rynders, often arrested for thimble-rigging and similar offences. He and Joseph Jewell, being indicted for murder fled from New York to New Orleans. By the by, I may here mention that this Jewell, who has indictments for murder in two different cases hanging up against him, was the standard-bearer of the Club, and figured as the bearer of the Texas banner in the processions. These worthies had not been long in New Orleans before they found it convenient to leave, being charged with stealing Treasury notes. They came to this city, and were arrested and sent back in irons by

order of "Captain" Tyler. I mention this circumstance to show the mutations of the times; for since the election this man Rynders, having become a great man among the Democracy, has not only dined with Benjamin F. Butler, when the electoral vote was given to Mr. Polk at Albany; not only has he received a complimentary ball from the chairman of the Democratic General Committee of the city of New York, but, having come on with his friend Jewell to this place for an office, as I am told, if the papers are to be relied on, he has been cordially received at the White House. Whether President Tyler or President Rynders then remembered the ironing, is not, however, chronicled. But I am digressing. John J. Austin, vice-president of the club, has likewise pending against him an indictment for murder, and was likewise implicated in the charge of stealing Treasury notes. Woolridge, its secretary, but recently came out of the penitentiary. William Ford, one of its directors, in the short interval of time which elapsed between the publication of a notice of one of its processions and the arrival of the day of parade, was indicted by the grand jury in seven cases, rape and burglary being among the offences. Being put in the Tombs, he unfortunately lost the opportunity of figuring on that occasion. Soon after tried and convicted of the first named crime, he was sent to the penitentiary, but, his services being valuable to the party, he was immediately pardoned and turned out by his Democratic excellency, Governor Bouck. I may remark, too, that this official dignitary, a short time before the election, restored to their political rights all the criminals in the State, and pardoned a great number who were in the penitentiary. This Empire Club, constituted as I have related, for some time devoted its energies to the prosecution of the laudable objects for which it had been originally organized.

Several weeks, however, before the election, the Democratic leaders thought it could be effectively employed in the political canvass, and they thereupon took its members into pay. These gentry being furnished with money thus by other means, abandoned for a time their peculiar avocations, and some of the neutral papers of the city made the subject of remark, the disappearance of these particular classes of crime. Their numbers rapidly increased from one or two hundred to not less than eight hundred; in fact they boasted that they had three thousand men enrolled. This Club, with other members of the Democratic party, perfected the most extensive system of fraudulent voting ever known. Sir, in what I have been stating, and what I am now about to state, I speak from information derived in part from public sources, but mainly from private ones; sources, however, on which I fully rely. I have taken pains to get accurate information. If there be error in any of my statements, which I am not prepared to admit, I desire to be contradicted. One of my objects is to provoke investigation into this matter. If anything which I can say or do here should induce this House to order an investigation into this whole transaction, I shall think I have done the country much service. Let gentlemen meet me on this ground. In the city of New York, there are more than seventy places at which votes are given in. I understand, sir, that one prominent feature of this plan was, that in

each of the seventeen wards into which the city is divided, there were one hundred and twenty picked men, each of whom was to leave his own ward and go to one where he was least known, on the evening before the election. Staying one night there enabled him to make oath that he resided in that ward, and he was permitted to vote there. He then returned to his own ward, and voted there without being questioned. But these two thousand and forty persons, however, formed but a part of those who voted more than once. From the information which I have received, I think that an investigation will show that there were companies of men who voted, in some instances, as much as sixteen times each. It was the calculation of the managers to give fourteen thousand illegal votes in the city, and they admit that they got in eleven thousand. A portion of these votes were excluded at some of the boxes, by the Whigs requiring them to state, on oath, if they had not already voted. This being an unusual question, offended many of them, and they retired with dignified disdain. The workingman's *Advocate*, a Democratic paper of the city, has admitted that the party agreed to give five dollars for every vote after the first one, which any individual could get in. Many of the gamblers predicted what occurred afterwards with wonderful accuracy. One of them, who happened to be a Whig, informed a prominent individual in the city, from whom I received the statement, long before the election, of the plan, and likewise notified him that on a future day, before the election, however, this matter would be published in a Democratic paper, (the *Plebian*, I think,) and charged on the Whigs as their plan, so as to divert suspicion; and, in the event of discovery by the Whig press, to anticipate such charge, and thus break its force. When the day came on, as predicted, the publication occurred in the *Plebian*.

There is said to have been an incident, of no great consequence in itself, which for a particular reason is worth a notice. I understand that the North Carolina line-of-battle ship was moored at the Brooklyn wharf, and it had been arranged that the men on board of her were to go ashore and vote for the gentleman who represents on this floor the Brooklyn district; and their votes, if received by him, would have been sufficient to elect him. But on the morning of the election, by some singular freak of that legerdemain which was practised on so extensive a scale that day, these men were in a body spirited across the river into the city, and voted mostly in the 7th ward, but partly in the 6th and 11th, for the Democratic member there, (I mean the only one of the present city delegation returned, Mr. Maclay.) These votes were just enough to save him. Now, I have no doubt but that the gentleman from Brooklyn. (Mr. Murphy) though he was overthrown by having the staff on which he was about to lean thus suddenly jerked from under him, by a brother Democrat, has public spirit and party devotion enough to be quite as well satisfied by a result which gives the party a member, as if he had been himself the successful individual. But the object I had in view, sir, in alluding to this incident, is to ascertain what is the standard of party morals as it respects the members themselves. What is their mode of dealing with Whigs I understand very well; but I had supposed, according to the old

proverb, that among its members there was honor in every profession. Will not some one enlighten the country as to this part of their code?

Sir, you remember that when the Whigs were in power, they passed a registry law that would have prevented most of these enormous frauds, but it was repealed by the Democratic party, and we see the fruits of that repeal. From the best information I can obtain, I am fully satisfied, that under the existing laws, provided by the Democratic party of that State, frauds enough can be perpetrated in the city alone, to determine the vote of that great State—in fact, I may say, the result of the Presidential election; for it will, perhaps, generally be close enough for its thirty-six electoral votes to decide the matter.

But it was not in the city alone that these things were done. Similar frauds were practised at Albany, by voters, some of whom were even carried from Philadelphia, it is said. Even in the interior, there are facts which furnish strong evidence of illegal voting. I should like for the gentleman (Mr. Preston King) who represents the district in which is St. Lawrence, (Mr. Wright's county, I think,) to inform us how it happened that that county gave sixteen hundred and twenty-seven votes more than it did at any preceding election? The Whig vote is stronger than it was when we carried the county, and yet we are beaten by about fifteen hundred. How comes it that that county has given nearly two thousand more votes than some with about the same population?

It is charged and believed by the Whigs, that a number of persons who had already voted elsewhere, were run across the line into that county and voted a second time, and that similar fraud was practiced in Jefferson, an adjoining county. Our friends believe, that in those two counties there were given some thirteen hundred illegal votes in that way. That the State of New York gave Henry Clay a majority of her legal votes cannot be doubted. Similar frauds were practiced in the State of Pennsylvania, with the like result, as I could show, if I had time to go into the details. We lost Louisiana in the same way. At the precinct in the parish of Plaquemines there were given eleven hundred votes, being seven hundred votes more than were ever given before at an election; a vote larger, I believe, than its whole population at the last census, including women and children. This case is so extraordinary as to require explanation. If this excess of votes above the usual amount were illegal, as I have no doubt they were, then their exclusion, to say nothing of frauds committed elsewhere, would have given Mr. Clay the vote of that State. Even in Georgia we have strong reason to believe that we were defeated by fraud. In that State, I understand, that voters under sixty years of age pay by law a poll-tax; all over that age, who possess property, are likewise obliged to pay a tax; so that the tax books kept and returned would have given all the voters except the paupers above sixty. Taking these books as a guide, there were 15,944 more votes than there appear to be voters. But the census shows that the number of males above sixty is a little more than three per cent. of the population. Deducting four per cent. for these, there would still remain 9,502 votes that cannot be accounted for. Most of this excess occurs in the Democratic

counties. As an example, I will read an extract from a highly respectable journal published in that State—the Milledgeville *Journal* :

“MORE FACTS CONNECTED WITH THE ABOVE.—The counties of Forsyth, Lumpkin, Habersham, and Franklin, are all nearly *in a line* connected with each other. Habersham joins Franklin, Lumpkin joins Habersham, and Forsyth joins Lumpkin. *These four counties* return to the Comptroller General's Office 3,080 voters. Add to this four per cent. (which is a large estimate) for men over sixty years of age, and not liable to be returned, but authorized to vote, and there would be 3,203 voters. At the late election, *the same counties* gave Mr. Polk 4,014, and Mr. Clay 1,821—in all 5,835 votes, and a majority for Polk of 2,193. Deduct from the aggregate vote of 5,835, 3,203, the number of voters returned on the tax book, and men over age, and it will be seen that *there are 2,632 voters of which no account is or can be given*, and WHO ARE NOT LEGALLY ENTITLED TO VOTE !

“But let us pursue *this line* a little further. Madison and Elbert join Franklin, Lincoln joins Elbert, and Columbia joins Lincoln. *These four counties* return to the Comptroller General's Office 2,986 voters. Add to this, as above, four per cent. for men over age, and there would be 3,105 voters. At the late election *these same counties* gave Mr. Clay 2,124, and Mr. Polk 999—in all 3,123 voters; and a majority for Clay of 1,125. Take the voters returned by the Tax Receiver with the per cent. for men over 60, and the votes given, and it will be seen, that while the *first four counties* have given *two thousand six hundred and thirty-two votes more than can be accounted for*, by the same information and estimate, *the last four have only given eighteen more than they are entitled to*. Elbert county, which gave 813 out of 1,125 majority for Clay, and which gave the largest majority of any county in the State, voted only thirty-seven more than is returned on the tax book; add the four per cent. for men over age, and it will be seen that she voted five less than she was entitled to.

“The last mentioned counties are Whig counties—the first are Democratic—which makes the fairest showing? No one can hesitate in his answer. Neither shall we hesitate to say that, in our opinion, HENRY CLAY has received a majority of the legal votes of the State of Georgia.”

If this result was produced by the voting of men under age, or other frauds in the Democratic counties, it is sufficient, without looking any further, to account for our defeat in that State, for the majority against us was only two thousand.

The four States of New York, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, and Georgia, give eighty-eight electoral votes. Added to Mr. Clay's vote of one hundred and five, and he would have one hundred and ninety-three votes, while James K. Polk would be left with only eighty-two. It is not strange, therefore, that our opponents should appear so moderate after the victory. It is not strange that they should not rejoice. No wonder some of them were astounded at the result. Too many of them know by what means this result was achieved. Did Macbeth rejoice when he looked at the crown and sceptre of the murdered Duncan? They look to the past with pain, to the future with dread.

This examination, Mr. Speaker, brings us irresistibly to the conclusion, not merely that the Whig measures of policy are approved by a vast majority of the people of the Union, but that, as a party, the Whigs are greatly the strongest in the country. So strong are they,

that nothing but a combination of all these adverse influences could have defeated us. Yes, sir, if any one of several of them had been wanting, we should still have triumphed, and had the election been conducted as our form of government presupposes, that is, fairly and honorably, Mr. Clay's majority would have been overwhelming.

Why then, is it, sir, since the past cannot be recalled, do I recur to these things? It is because I am satisfied, after a survey of the battle field, that in future a different result may be produced. Yes, sir, if we do our duty to the country, these evils may be averted, sufficiently at least for all practical purposes. A century may pass away before the country is afflicted with such another accident as the present executive.

The course of the Abolition party has stripped them of much of their influence, by bringing them into general contempt, even at the North. Besides, their late movements will array a strong influence against them in other quarters, more than enough to counterbalance their strength. And if the foreign Catholics, or foreigners generally, continue banded together, with a view of controlling the elections of the country, there will be aroused antagonistic feelings in the hearts of all true Americans, which will sweep away the party to which they have attached themselves. But, sir, I wish it distinctly understood, that I am for no Native American party; I care not whether a man may have been born under the icy zone that girds the pole, or in the torrid clime; where the morning sun is first seen, or at the place of his going down, if he comes to this land, and, after the residence prescribed by law, and in the manner provided, takes an oath to support the constitution, and adopts with it an American heart, American feelings, determining then to uphold and defend the rights and interests of this country against all others, that man will I take by the hand and welcome, as an American citizen should be, by his fellows. I wish, however, to see no British Whig, no French Whig, no man, in short, who places the interest or honor of another nation in the scale against that of this, or who resides among us with feelings alien to our government or its institutions. I desire to see the destinies of this country controlled in future, as they have in the main been heretofore, by the great American Whig party. By that party, and its genuine Republican principles, am I willing to stand or fall.

It is our duty, as far as it may be in our power, by wise legislation, to prevent fraudulent naturalization and illegal voting. But this alone, will be insufficient to ensure its success. Even though we should be able to see, that the combination of circumstances, to which our defeat was owing in the present instance, will not occur again, yet it must be remembered, that there will be other factions to be moved, and new humbugs invented. It is absolutely necessary that the Whigs should be completely organized as a party, not to deceive the confiding, the credulous, or the ignorant, but to protect them from imposition; not to practice frauds, but to prevent their commission by our adversaries. Had we adopted a proper system of organization, we should have triumphed in despite of all the adverse influences referred to. To accomplish this, will, I know, require more labor than many

are willing to undergo. It was a frequent complaint of Cicero, that in his day that the republic was always attacked with more zeal than it was defended; and, with us, it is a common boast of our adversaries, that while the Whigs are talking they are working. But unless we make up our minds to undergo the necessary exertion, our political system will soon become the most corrupt, and, by consequence, the most despotic on earth. Such a government will, by its heavy taxation, wars, &c., impose on us burdens much more intolerable than would be the effort necessary to preserve our liberties. By a proper system of organization, we shall always triumph, because our principles are those upon which this great republic has heretofore been successfully and prosperously governed; and the great mass of our population, being honest and patriotic, will, with proper lights, sustain them.

What, then, Mr. Chairman, is the prospect before us? Your party having come into power, your situation is altogether different from what it was in the late contest. You must show your hand by your acts, not by mere words. Why, sir, we never could have beaten Mr. Van Buren in 1840 if we had had only his declaration of principles to contend against. Your situation is doubly embarrassing from the duplicity which, as a party, you practiced to obtain power. As far as measures alone are concerned, you might, I grant, unite. But there is to be a struggle for pre-eminence of place, and measures will be the pivots on which party evolutions will turn. Ostensibly, the contest may be about the annexation of Texas and the tariff, because certain prominent men are connected in public estimation with particular sides of these questions.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the action of the majority on these questions will be regarded as the index of the rising or sinking of the fortunes of particular cliques, great importance may be attached to the decision on these questions of a party whose members are known generally to have a decided partiality for the strongest side. The Northern portion of the party is the more numerous, the stronger in the country, and by far the most skilful in party tactics. But then it was solely owing to the exertions of the Southern section that Mr. Van Buren was set aside and Mr. Polk nominated; and can he be so ungrateful as to turn his back on those to whom he owes his elevation? If the Northern wing can get the offices, their consciences will be quieted as to the extension of slavery, and they will go for the annexation of Texas. But in that event, the tariff will become intolerable to the South, and Mr. Calhoun's going out of office will be the signal for another nullification agitation, for which Mr. Polk has very little appetite, not being considered remarkable for nerve in trying times.

As I have had occasion to allude to John C. Calhoun, I take it upon myself to say, that, looking at his course for more than twelve years, with the exception of a few years after 1837, when he hoped from his new connection with the Democratic party that he might become President of all the United States—I say, sir, that his course, whether considered with reference to the tariff and nullification, to agitation on the subject of abolition and slavery, or to his mode of

managing the Texas question, is precisely that which a man of ordinary sagacity would take who designed to effect a dissolution of the Union. And that such is his object can only be denied by those who hold him a monomaniac. As it was said that Julius Caesar went forward soberly and steadily to the ruin of the Republic, so has John C. Calhoun gone on coolly and deliberately to break up the Union and substitute a Southern Confederacy. If his being kept in office by Mr. Polk should have the effect of inducing him to abandon those views, instead of using his official station and influence to promote them, then for the sake of the repose of the country, I should be pleased to see him retained. It is my opinion that he will be distinguished from his present colleagues in the Cabinet, and retained for a time, ostensibly to finish pending negotiations. He will then, by intrigue, or it may be by public opinion, be forced out, and will go into honorable exile at a foreign court; or retire, like Cincinnatus, to his plough, or possibly come back to the Senate to agitate. While he is in office, too, as many of his peculiar followers will be supplied with offices as may be needed to secure the support of the "chivalry" to the administration.

I am here reminded, sir, that some of those gentlemen have expressed strong hopes that they will be able to overrun and carry off with them the old North State; and I learn that a great effort is to be made by the combined energies of the party for that purpose. But I can tell those gentlemen that J. C. Calhoun and his clique have never had the ear of North Carolina. In 1832, with great unanimity, she took ground against them for the Union, and she is still for it. She is also a genuine Whig State. She was Whig in 1775, when she made the first declaration of independence, and her sons still in their hearts cherish and will maintain the principles of their fathers. Tennessee, too, is Whig. I saw something of the canvass there during the summer. There were directed against her the combined influences of Texas, the Tariff, Jackson and Polk, backed by the powerful organization which I have described, and under it she has borne up all nobly. There is a State to be depended on in times of trial. On her a timid man might risk his life, or a brave one trust his honor. Louisiana is Whig to-day, fairly tried. So, too, is Georgia; or, if bent a moment by the blast, unbroken, her banner will resume its place in the Whig line. The Whigs are firm everywhere. The means used to defeat will strengthen us. The fall, like that of Antæus, will give redoubled vigor and energy. The terrible calamity sustained will rouse the nation to avert its consequences. But we must endeavor so to triumph that the fruits of victory will not be lost. Our adversaries have set a most lamentable example. Instead of selecting a man high in the confidence of the country, and rewarding him for past services, they have chosen a mere man of straw, one so unknown that he might be run on opposite principles in different sections. In thus demonstrating the availability of such a man, they have done all in their power to discourage statesmanlike eminence and patriotism. Our candidate was defeated because he was too honest, too open, and too manly to conceal his opinions. Gentlemen on the other side of the House may exult in the event, but they know that he was overthrown in no fair

or manly contest. It was the Hector of Shakspeare, surrounded and impaled by myrmidons,

“The earth that bears *him* dead, bears not alive so stout a gentleman.”

Many a bright eye and manly heart mourns over him, but he needs it not:

Woe! unto us, not *him*, for *he rests well*.”

Instead of the dark cypress, there will wave over him the bright green laurels of glory, and they will become greener and brighter as the centuries roll on. But we shall often want his sagacious head, his eloquent tongue, and heart of fire. Since he came on the stage of action, in every crisis,

“One blast upon his bugle horn
Was worth a thousand men.”

Sir, it is not talent alone that makes the great statesman. There must be added to high intellect a paramount devotion to ones country, a determination to sacrifice everything of self to promote its advancement. No statesman, no man ever felt this principle in a greater degree than Henry Clay. And, till life shall fade, he will stand erect with a spirit unbroken, in the front rank of those who rally around the Constitution and the Union.

If he bears himself well, so does his party. I declare, sir, I have seen nothing, I have heard of nothing, I have read of nothing like it. Whether it be a voice from the mountains of my own district, or from the densely populated cities of the North, it breathes the same spirit. I have seen no one Whig who regretted his course; no one who would not rather be in exile with Brutus than triumphing with Antony; no one who will not go into battle again with more ardor than he went into the former action. Considering its numbers, so help me God, I believe there has existed not upon earth a party so noble. If it cannot preserve this great country, then, sir, you may burn the Constitution, for it is worthless.

NOTE.

Persons will observe as much difference in the tone of these two speeches as in their substance. The first seems to be the effort of a man hunting for reasons to support a conclusion already arrived at. The second is the result of deep sorrow for what was regarded as a great public calamity, and intense indignation against the authors of the wrong.

To those unacquainted with the state of political excitement then prevailing, this speech will seem excessively violent; but in giving expression to my own earnest feelings, I did not exceed the bounds which party friends justified. The Rev. Mr. Hammett, a Democratic Representative from Mississippi, but a personal friend, afterwards told me that I had said the bitterest things ever uttered on the floor of the House. Mr. Mosely, of New York, a political friend, said that the Democrats, while I was speaking reminded him of a flock of geese on hot iron. During the first part of the speech, Dromgoole, of Virginia, who sat just by me, seemed to enjoy quietly

my hits at the Calhoun wing of the party, between which and the Van Buren or Hunker Democrats there was much jealousy and ill feeling; but after I directed my attack on the northern wing of his party, his manner changed and his countenance indicated much subdued anger. I was subsequently told that many members of the party insisted that unless Mr. Yancey, who obtained the floor to speak next day, would assail me violently, that he should give way to some other member of the party. Hence his remarks, which led to a personal difficulty, were perhaps influenced to some extent by the wishes of his political friends.

In fact, till the end of the session I was in the almost daily receipt of threatening letters, purporting to come from members of the Empire Club and other discontented individuals.

Among Whigs the feeling was as strong on the other side. Mr. Mangum, my Senatorial colleague, said that the public mind had been in such a plastic state from its high excitement, that my speech had moulded it into a fixed shape, in accordance with the views presented. Senator Davis, of Massachusetts (honest John) told me one evening at his house, that he had received so many letters asking for the speech that he had sent seven thousand copies in pamphlet form to his constituents. The Whig party was then so indignant, united and resolute that it could have carried the country. Before the next Presidential election, by reason of the issues raised through the acquisition of the territory taken from Mexico, the political condition of the country was so changed that the Whig party had scarcely the form, and little of the substance, of a compact political organization.

[It being regarded as certain that the Mexican war would, at its close, bring an acquisition of territory to the United States, an excited controversy had arisen in the country as to whether that territory should become free or slave-holding. The Wilmot proviso, declaring that the territory should forever be free, had been pressed, and all the Whigs from the North, with part of the Democrats, had regularly voted for it. On the other hand, most of the Southern States had taken the position that if slaveholders were by Congress excluded from all the territory, such an action would justify resistance.

It was also claimed that as Mexico, in all her territory, had abolished slavery, the institution could not exist there without positive legislation to establish it. Mr. Clay subsequently maintained this view, and insisted on the declaration of his two great principles; first, that slavery could not exist without a positive law to support it; and secondly, that as it had been abolished there, it could not legally exist.

General Cass had in his Nicholson letter taken ground for "non-intervention by Congress" on the subject, and Judge McLean, also a Presidential aspirant, in an article published in the *Intelligencer* occupied similar ground, and even went to the length of denying the right of Congress to legislate on the subject.

At the time when Congress assembled, it seemed probable that not only would the Whig party be destroyed as a national organization, but that a separation of the States might be caused, or, at least, war might result. At an early day of the session the following speech was made. Because the principle of division had been adopted in the instance of the Missouri line, and also to meet the allegation that slavery having been excluded could not

exist without further legislation, I sought to maintain the right in Congress so to act, as to provide that the territory might be enjoyed by both sections of the Union.

Again, in the hope that the Whigs in the North might be induced to meet us on middle ground, and thus save the party from destruction, I, while attacking the abolitionists, also condemned the former action of certain men at the South. Unless some middle ground could be found, I felt confident that not only would the Whig party be destroyed, but that also the union of the States would be endangered.]

SPEECH

ON THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF THE SLAVE QUESTION, DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 22, 1847.

The House being in Committee of the Whole, Mr. CLINGMAN obtained the floor, and said:

MR. CHAIRMAN: When, the other day, in debate, gentlemen of the other side of the house spoke of a black cloud overhanging the country, and of there being danger from abolitionism to the South, it was impossible to mistake their meaning. As I did not then regard such remarks as in order, I allowed them to pass without reply. We have now, however, the subject fairly before us. The President says in his message now under consideration, that we must have territory from Mexico; and his friends on this floor, from the North, insist that this territory shall be appropriated to the use of the free States exclusively. This presents a great question—a question which has been discussed for twelve months over the whole country, and which must be met by this House. If that question be debated in good temper, no evil can result to the country from the discussion. I, therefore, avail myself of this, the first fair opportunity for the expression of my views in relation to the whole subject.

It is known, sir, that on a former occasion I differed with a majority of the Southern members of this House, upon a question indirectly having some relation to the subject of slavery. I voted against the rule excluding abolition petitions, not only because I regarded that rule as an infringement of the right of petition, but because I was well aware that most of the citizens of the Northern States viewed it in that light; and I was not willing to do violence to the feelings of a large portion of the Union, for the mere purpose of preserving a rule that was of no practical advantage in itself. I voted against the rule, because I saw that by its continuance, we obliged the friends of the Constitution and of the South, to fight the Abolitionists at home, upon the weakest of all the issues that could be presented, so that we were losing ground, and the Abolitionists gaining thereby. I saw clearly, that by these means, these disorganizers had acquired a great show of strength, by blending with themselves the friends of the right of petition. They were thus, too, promoting the object they had in view, of getting up excitement, and producing ill-feeling between the North

and the South. I saw, too, that our seeking this new defence implied that the Constitution and laws of our forefathers were insufficient barriers for our protection, and that this seeming confession of weakness and fear on our part had encouraged our adversaries, and stimulated them to fresh attacks. For these, and other reasons which have heretofore been stated, I opposed that rule, and I now recur to it merely to say that subsequent experience has given me additional reason to be satisfied with my course.

That obstacle has been removed, and we are now thrown back to our old position, the original ground of defence occupied by us in the morning of our Government, when the sun of the Constitution, just risen, shed its freshest and purest light over the Union. Thirteen States, till then independent, sovereign and equal, had united to form a government for their common benefit. It was their avowed purpose to create such a system as would confer equal advantages on each State and its citizens. If, in the formation of that government any inequality was produced, (which is not admitted,) that injustice was not the object of the makers, and not intended by them. It was their plain purpose, not only to give each of the States and its citizens equal advantages throughout the Union and its territories, but, out of abundant caution, they provided that every citizen of the United States should in each State be entitled to all the privileges of a citizen of that State; each State and its citizen might claim a fair share, not only of all that the Government had in possession, but of all it had a prospect of acquiring. Not only was each State entitled to the equal protection of such armies and fleets as the Government then had, but should new armies be raised, or other ships be built in aftertimes, they were to stand on the same footing. Whatever the government might acquire, simply because it was the government of the *United States*, it would hold in trust for the use of all the States. For example, when afterwards the lower Mississippi was acquired from France, all the States were equally entitled to the benefits of its navigation. Had Congress excluded the citizens of any State from its use, and had it said to them: "You have no right to complain of this; all the rivers within the limits of the United State to which you became a party are still open to you. There are the Hudson, the Potomac, the Ohio, and others; we do not exclude you from them; as to this lower Mississippi, you never had any right to its use, and have no grounds to complain of the exclusion." Such an act and such reasoning would have been at war with the spirit and against the plain intent of the Constitution. This view, that all the States and their citizens were equally entitled to the advantages of the government, both in possession and in prospect, is so obvious, that I need not dwell on it.

It has been contended, however, that the Constitution intended to limit slavery to the States where it then existed, and to exclude it from the Territories of the United States. Of the thirteen States which created the Constitution, twelve were then slaveholding: Massachusetts alone having, during the war of the Revolution, abolished slavery. The supposition that the States would exclude from *all the Territories of the United States* an institution which prevailed so generally among

them, seems improbable in itself, and those who maintain it, may well be required to furnish the evidence. There is not, sir, in the whole Constitution any one clause which, either directly or indirectly, favors the idea that slavery was to be limited to the States where it then existed, or to be excluded from any part of the territory of the United States. The idea of identifying slavery with territory, seems never to have entered the minds of the framers of the Constitution. There is, however, Mr. Chairman, another limitation of slavery of a different character, to which I will beg leave to call the attention of the House. The Constitution provides that Congress may, in its discretion, after the year 1808, prohibit the importation of slaves into the United States. The circumstances under which this provision was adopted may properly be brought to mind. It is well known that in the Convention which framed the Constitution there was great difficulty upon the subject of allowing slaves to be represented. After, however, it had been settled, by repeated votes of the Convention, that three-fifths of the slaves should be counted in apportioning representation among the States, Luther Martin, of Maryland, (the subject of the regulation of trade being under consideration,) said that, as three-fifths of the slaves were to be counted in representation, that circumstance might operate as an inducement to the importation of such persons, and he moved to give Congress the power to prohibit or tax the importation of slaves. This motion met strenuous opposition from the members of the Convention from South Carolina and Georgia. They were supported in their opposition by the members from Connecticut and Massachusetts, who insisted that each State should be allowed to import what it pleased; that the morality or wisdom of slavery belonged to the State alone; that it was a political matter, which should be left to it; while, on the other hand, the members from Virginia and Pennsylvania were, with Martin, in favor of giving the power of exclusion. The debate was long and excited. There was also much difficulty on the subject of giving the power to regulate trade by navigation acts. It was contended that the principal inducements which the North had to form the Union, was the benefit which they expected to derive from the exercise of this power; while the Southern members insisted that a vote of two-thirds in Congress should be necessary to give validity to navigation acts; which would, in effect, have rendered the power nugatory. In the midst of these difficulties, which seemed likely to render the attempt to form a common government abortive, Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, suggested that the subject of the importation of slaves, and that of a tax on exports, and navigation acts, should all be committed, so as to form a bargain between the Northern and Southern States. The report from the committee provided that the importation might be prohibited after the year 1800; but, on the motion of General Pinckney, the time was extended till 1808; the members from New England voting with Maryland and the three Southern States; while Virginia, who was said to have then more slaves than she needed, voted against the amendment, with New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware. In this form it was ultimately adopted, as a consideration for the power given the government to pass

navigation acts and regulate trade. It would be out of place here to inquire which section has gained most by the bargain—whether the North has been more benefitted by our tariff laws than the South by the importation of slaves.

My purpose is to call the attention of the House to the nature of the limitation of slavery established by the Constitution. It not only preserved the institution as it then existed, and provided for the representation of the slaves, but it allowed their numbers to be indefinitely increased for the next twenty years by importations; after which it was to cease, if Congress saw fit. But there was no power given to exclude free persons. The Constitution of the United States, therefore, was obviously made to govern all those who were then in the country, whether freemen or slaves, and their descendants—all free persons who might come into the country in all time, and also all slaves which might be imported up to the year 1808. The partnership or compact of government embraced all of these. It permitted an indefinite increase of free persons, but limited the number of slaves. That limitation was most clearly of the numbers of the slaves, not of the territory they might occupy. The framers of the Constitution seem to have entertained, with respect to liberty and slavery, the old fashioned notions—such notions, I mean, as prevailed among the civilians and common lawyers of the world; among political and philosophical writers, and mankind generally—that is, that liberty was a personal right, and not one annexed to land or territory. They supposed that they were promoting the cause of liberty by limiting the number of persons who might become slaves, and thereby preventing an indefinite extension of slavery. But, the number of slaves being limited and fixed, it did not seem to be a matter of moment to confine their residence to particular portions of territory. They seem to have had no conception of the fashionable phrase of our day, *area of slavery*, which must not be extended.

I am now brought, Mr. Chairman, to the direct consideration of the great question as to the extent of the powers and duties of Congress in relation to slavery in the territories of the United States. Upon this subject a distinguished politician from the South, (Mr. Calhoun,) in the other wing of this building, some twelve months since, laid down certain doctrines, which are, in substance, as near as I can remember them, these: The territories of the United States, being the common property of the Union, are held by Congress in trust, for the use and benefit of all the States and their citizens; secondly, that Congress has no right to exclude by law any citizens of the United States from going into any part of said territories, and carrying with them and holding any such property as they are allowed to hold in the States from which they come. This view, though perhaps plausible at the first glance, is really the most shallow and superficial that could possibly be presented. Admitting the first general proposition to be true, (and no fair mind can question it,) that the territories of the United States are held by Congress in trust for the use and benefit of all the States and their citizens, I am free to confess, that if Congress should see that it was most advantageous to allow all the citizens to occupy

all the territory in common, with their property, it doubtless ought so to provide. But it is equally clear that if, on the other hand Congress should see that all the other citizens of the United States could not thus advantageously occupy the territory in common, it might divide the same so as to assign certain portions to particular classes or persons. Why, sir, according to this mode of reasoning, it might be insisted that the army could not be divided so as to place particular regiments and companies to defend certain points in exclusion of others, because each regiment and each man belongs to the whole United States, and Congress has no right to deprive any State of the services of any one soldier. Each national ship must be employed to convoy every merchantman at the same moment. Yes, sir, according to this system of ratiocination, inasmuch as the National Treasury belongs to the whole United States, each dollar therein belongs to all the citizens, and Congress, therefore, has no right to direct the expenditure of a particular dollar in one State, and thereby deprive all the other citizens of its enjoyment. But these propositions, sir, are too absurd in themselves to justify serious consideration, and I only have referred to them at all because of the high quarter from which they come.

I return, then, to the great question. What is the condition of the territory of the United States? It might possibly be argued, that inasmuch as the Constitution provides for the representation of slaves and for their admission up to 1808, and is totally silent as to what part of the United States they should be confined to, that it may fairly be presumed that they were intended to be excluded from no part of the Union, except as far as the States themselves might determine to exclude them, and that therefore Congress had no right to interfere in the matter at all. I lay no stress, however, on this argument, but think that the question must be settled on other principles. The Constitution gives Congress "power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory of the United States." This grant of power is general and vague. To ascertain its extent we must resort to implication. It has sometimes been contended that the right of self-government was for a time in abeyance or suspended as to the territories. To this view I cannot assent; the right of self-government naturally belongs to every community; that right can never be annihilated or destroyed, though it may be transferred. Unless some other community or sovereign has acquired the authority to control it, the first community always possesses the right of self-government. So neither can these powers be in a state of suspension, except by their being temporarily transferred to some other sovereign or government. It is conceded on all hands that the inhabitants of the territory have no rights of legislation, and it is equally clear that none of the States have any power to govern it. All the powers that can be exercised belong to Congress alone; Congress has powers to make all *needful rules and regulations*. But the wants of all communities are in legal contemplation the same; the wants of the territories may be, and in fact are, just as great as those of the States. It seems to me then, Mr. Chairman, with due deference to those who have given the subject graver consideration than I have been able to do, that Congress in leg-

islating for the territories is controlled only by the Constitution of the United States. It is equally true, however, that the people of the several States are likewise controlled by this Constitution; whether acting in convention or through their ordinary legislative governments, they can do nothing contrary to it. Congress has then over the territory just such powers as its legislature would have after it became a State. Both are controlled by the Constitution of the United States, the supreme law of the land. As this Constitution is silent in relation to slavery, it has been argued on the one hand that Congress can do nothing to exclude it from the territory; on the other hand, it is asserted with equal confidence that for the same reason there is no power to establish the institution. These two opposite views are worthy antagonists, and I shall leave them to contend, not fearing that either will ever obtain a victory over the other.

Congress has general legislative powers over the territories; but one of the most important duties of the law-making power is to determine the rights of property. What shall be property, how titles shall be acquired and maintained, it is the province of the municipal law of every country to determine. This principle is so generally recognized, and has been so universally acted on among mankind, that it need not be enlarged upon. It has been insisted in certain quarters, however, that liberty being the natural right of all, no property could be acquired over persons, and that all attempts of government to legalize slavery in any form, are to be esteemed unnatural, illegal and utterly void. To deny the right of government to recognize property in persons is easy, because it is easy to deny anything; but to determine what is natural among men, you must refer to the conduct and practice of mankind generally. To ascertain what powers governments may properly exercise, you must refer to the action of political States and the conduct of nations generally. In this mode we determine the laws of nations and the rights and duties of governments. Under the guidance of these principles, how are we to determine the question? We find that the nations of the earth, from the earliest historic ages, have generally recognized and established the system of slavery. As to how the matter was between the Creation and the Deluge we have no knowledge, but we do know that shortly after the latter event the institution existed, not only among the patriarchs of the Jewish people, but among all the nations from which we have any accounts. Among the Jews slavery was limited in this respect. If a male Hebrew became a slave to one of his own countrymen, after seven years service he was made free. But this privilege seems not have extended to his wife, if a slave, nor to his children, nor was it ever held to apply to slaves obtained from other nations. From those times downward the institution seems generally to have prevailed among the nations of the earth. If the free States of Greece, Rome and Carthage seem to have had a larger proportion of slaves than most of the nations of their day, it is doubtless to be attributed to the fact that those Republics, by reason of their superiority both in civil and military art and science, were more powerful than their contemporaries, and thereby able to make a greater number of captives in war. So general was the system, that, while it

is easy to find those who denied the right of property in *land*, it is difficult to discover a people who questioned the right to make property of *persons*. At length the Council of Macen, towards the end of the sixth century after Christ, decreed that no Christian should be compelled to remain a slave, and Gregory ordained that no heathen desirous of becoming a Christian should be retained in slavery. From the limitations of these orders, it is obvious that they were made not so much to promote the natural rights of men, as the spreading of Christianity.

During the thirteenth century slavery is supposed to have ceased in Italy, and not long afterwards in some of the other nations of Western Europe. In England we find Henry VIII, in the year 1514, during one of his pious fits, manumitting two of his villeins, and by the close of that century slavery appears to have ceased in England. On this side of the Atlantic, too, the institution has generally prevailed in former times, and since our national existence commenced it prevailed in all the then States. Even in those States where slavery proper has been abolished, as well as in England, property in persons is still recognized, and the wife and children are regarded in law as the servants of the husband and father; and when they are injured he brings an action for the loss of their services by reason of the injury. I have high abolition authority for saying that more than half of christendom now hold slaves. The highest court in England, where the abolition spirit seems to be strongest, has decided that slavery is not contrary to the law of nations. These things being considered, Mr. Chairman, it is a great misnomer to speak of our institutions at the South as *peculiar*. Ours is the general system of the world, and the *free* system is the *peculiar* one.

If, then, Congress possesses general legislative powers over the territories, as I contend, it is idle to deny that slavery may either be permitted or forbidden to exist there.

What ought the government to do? The territories being the common property of the United States, it is the duty of Congress to dispose of them, as far as practicable, for the use and benefit of all the States. If the government, either directly, or indirectly, should by its action intentionally so dispose of the territories as to confer greater advantages on some of the States than on others, then it would be guilty of a breach of the high trust confided to it. Should it declare in advance that it would exclude any of the States and their citizens from *all the territories* of the Union, this would be a gross violation of the constitution as it could commit. Being the Government of the *United States*, whatever it has, it must hold and administer for the benefit of all the parties to the constitution. One-half of the States have slaves, the other half have none. Should Congress establish slavery in all the territories, and should that circumstance render them less desirable to the citizens of the free States, and thereby prevent their going into and occupying them, such a disposition, giving greater advantages to the people of one section than to those of the other, would be unjust and unconstitutional. On the other hand, should Congress exclude slavery from all the territories of the Union, so as to prevent the

citizens of the slave States from occupying them, such a measure would be at war with the *spirit of the constitution*.

To enable the government, therefore, so to dispose of the territories as to promote the common benefit, and thereby carry out the plain intention of the constitution, it obviously becomes necessary and proper for it to divide them, so as to permit one section to be exclusively occupied by freemen, and the other by those who may hold slaves. By such a course only can it promote the general benefit of the whole Union, for which it was created.

The practice of the government heretofore has been substantially in accordance with these principles. At the formation of the constitution, though twelve of the thirteen States held slaves, it was well understood that the more Northern ones having very few, and being without any inducement to retain them, would soon be relieved entirely of slavery. The government, therefore, left to be occupied by slaveholders all that portion of its territories out of which has since been created the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, and provided that the country north of the Ohio river should be exclusively occupied by freemen. Its subsequent policy has been consistent. The compromise, at the time Missouri was admitted into the Union, was right in principle, though it may have been liable to objection, because it gave the free States more than three-fourth of the territory which the government then held. The subsequent acquisitions of Florida and Texas have tended to remedy this inconvenience.

I do not, however, Mr. Chairman, admit for one moment the doctrine advanced in some quarters, that the government ought to acquire territory to strengthen either the free or the slave States as against the other section. Being the government of the *United States*, it is not justified in using its powers for the advancement of some of the States at the expense of the others. If, independently of these considerations, there are substantial national reasons for the acquisition of territory, it may be acquired. Should it lie on our northern frontier, then, on account of its contiguity to the free States, cold climate, and for other reasons which need not now be given, it should be made free territory. Should it be on our southern border, it ought to be open to the citizens of the slave States, who, by reason of their contiguity, similarity of climate, &c., would most conveniently occupy it, and it ought to tolerate slavery. Should it be on our western border, fairness would seem to require its division with reference to the considerations above stated.

It is often asserted, however, Mr. Chairman, in declamation rather than in argument, that the Declaration of Independence proclaims all men to be free and equal; that that declaration has never been repealed; and that, being now in force, it should control the action of the government. That declaration was made to dissolve the political bonds which connected us with Great Britain. Its validity for that purpose cannot be questioned, and the act as such is still in force. But the reasons which induced the Congress to take such a decisive step formed no part of the act itself. It might as well be insisted that the reasons given in the report of a committee recommending the

passage of a bill formed a part of the law itself. The declaration, as made, was supported by a most able and eloquent popular appeal to the people of the colonies and to all the world. It was made in behalf of States, every one of which then held and continued to hold slaves. It never occurred to any one in that day that the opinions and statements contained in the declaration became a part of any of the State constitutions or of the Articles of Confederation of the United States. Even had it been otherwise, it has since been superseded by the Constitution of the United States; just as those articles, which were once undoubtedly in force, by that act lost their validity, and cannot therefore in any manner now influence the action of Congress. As soon, however, as the people of the territory have made a republican form of government for themselves, the constitution takes the general legislative powers from Congress, and gives them to the new State.

I am now brought, Mr. Chairman, to the consideration of a great question in our political system, "What is a republican form of government," such as the United States guarantees to every State in the Union? Eminent men, with whom I am accustomed to act on many questions, hold that it gives such a control over the form of the State constitutions as I cannot sanction. On a former occasion, in this House, when opposition was made to the admission of Florida into the Union, on account of the pro-slavery character of her constitution, I took occasion, when supporting her claim to admission, to express my dissent from those doctrines. Others have maintained that this feature of the constitution was intended to exclude slavery entirely from the territories and the States; while, with a third class, the term "republican" is understood to be synonymous with perfect equality, politically, of all persons whatever. What is a "republican form of government?" I know, Mr. Chairman, that there is indisposition on the part of some to go into such considerations. They are indifferent to everything that does not promise an immediate result. Many sneer at abstractions and condemn inquiries into the fundamental principles of government. If, sir, by remaining ignorant of the great principles which have regulated the rise, progress, and destruction of governments and States, we could escape entirely the action of these principles, then, perhaps, "ignorance" would be "bliss." But no man escapes the action of the natural laws by remaining ignorant of them. The force of gravity acts as violently upon the clown as it does upon the philosopher, who understands its laws. The winds and the waves of the ocean strike with as much violence the rude craft, constructed and directed in profound ignorance of their forces, as they do the sides of the best built ship directed by those who are familiar with the stormy seas. If a man should sleep in his canoe in the stream immediately above the cataract of Niagara, he would not thereby suspend, as to himself, the action of that current. He who is selected to direct the motions of a steam engine should be acquainted with its powers. The laws which control the courses of States and the action of governments, are not less fixed and certain than those which operate in the physical world.

What, then, is a "republican form of government," that system which is to control the political destinies of the people of the American Union? Perhaps there are few terms in our language more difficult to define precisely. Mr. Madison, in the *Federalist*, admits as much. In Walker's and Johnson's dictionaries, the books of the kind perhaps in most common use among us, "a republic" is defined to be "a State in which the power is lodged in more than one." In this definition they seem to follow Addison. Worcester, who has published the latest and most comprehensive dictionary, says: "A republic may be either a democracy or an aristocracy. In the latter it is vested in a nobility, or a privileged class of comparatively a small number of persons." This is substantially the same with Montesquien's definition of a republic in his *Spirit of Laws*. Polybius, whom, notwithstanding the early times in which he lived, I regard as perhaps the most sagacious of political writers, considers a republic as a mixture of the features of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy in equal proportions, so that any two of these powers or estates might, by their combination, be able to prevent the usurpation or abuses of the third. Such a government, he thought, would, by its executive, secure the *strength* of monarchy; by its Senate, the *steadiness* and *wisdom* of aristocracy; and by its democracy ensure that its action would be directed to the promotion of the public good. He regarded the Roman Government of his day, then in its purest, healthiest, and most perfect condition, though it afterwards decayed and was destroyed in the manner pointed out and predicted by him, he, I say, looking on this government with the disinterested eye of a stranger and a captive, pronounced it the most perfect republic that had ever been known. I refer particularly to this government, because the word "republic" was a Roman word, invented to designate, and always applied to that system. Not only did monarchical and aristocratic features predominate in its constitution, but it sustained the system of domestic slavery in its most extensive form. During more than three hundred years, and the period of its greatest strength and prosperity, it was computed that the whole number of slaves was three times as great as the number of freemen. Athenæus states that he knew many Romans who owned ten and twenty thousand slaves. A single *freedman*, in the reign of Augustus, had acquired, at the time of his death, above four thousand slaves.

If we come down to our own times, we find that these views of political writers were familiar to the minds of the framers of our constitution, and constant topics of discussion in the convention. Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, said: "The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy. The people do not want virtue, but are the dupes of pretended patriots. In Massachusetts it has been fully confirmed by experience, that they are daily misled into the most baneful measures and opinions by the false reports circulated by designing men, and which no one on the spot can refute."

Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, observed, "That the general object was to provide a cure for the evils under which the United States labored; that in tracing these evils to their origin, every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy;" and argued in favor of a Senate as a check to this tendency in their governments.

Mr. Mason, his colleague, "argued strongly for an election of the larger branch by the people. It was to be the grand depository of the democratic principle of the government."

Mr. Madison said: "No agrarian attempts have yet been made in this country; but symptoms of a levelling spirit, as we have understood, have sufficiently appeared in a certain quarter to give notice of the future danger. How is the danger to be guarded against on republican principles? He argued that a Senate, elected for the term of nine years, would perhaps answer the purpose; and in conclusion declared "that, as it was more than probable that we were now digesting a plan which, in its operation, would decide forever the fate of republican government, we ought not only to provide every guard for liberty that its preservation could require, but be careful to supply the defects which our own experience had particularly pointed out."

Mr. Ellsworth, of Connecticut, said: "Massachusetts cannot keep the peace one hundred miles from her capital, and is now forming an army for its support. How long Pennsylvania may be free from a like situation cannot be foreseen." And, in reply to his colleague, (Mr. Sherman) who spoke favorably of the condition of Connecticut, Mr. Hamilton, of New York, said that there "of late the government had entirely given way to the people, and had in fact suspended many of its ordinary functions in order to prevent those turbulent scenes which had appeared elsewhere." He asked Mr. Sherman whether the State at this time "dare impose and collect a tax on the people?" In the same speech he said, "he concurred with Mr. Madison in thinking that we were now about to decide forever the fate of republican government," making references to the Roman and other republican governments. And on another occasion, he said, in debate, "they suppose seven years a sufficient period to give the Senate adequate firmness, from not duly considering the amazing violence and turbulence of the democratic spirit. When a great object of government is pursued, which seizes the popular passions, they spread like wild-fire and become irresistible. He appealed to the gentleman from New England whether experience had not then verified the remark." After referring to many countries, he said: "What is the inference from all these observations? That we ought to go as far in order to attain stability and permanency as republican principles will admit. Let one branch of the legislature hold their places for life, or at least during good behavior; let the executive also be for life."

It may seem a little singular, Mr. Chairman, that all references in these debates to disturbances are in the sections of the Union having few or no slaves. I have not made the extracts, however, with any intention of showing this, but to make it appear in what sense the framers of the Constitution understood the meaning of "republican form of government." As the clause was originally adopted by the Convention in Committee of the Whole, it stood thus:

"16. *Resolved*, That a republican constitution, and its *existing laws*, ought to be guaranteed to each State by the United States."

Why guaranty the *existing laws*, if twelve of the constitutions, because they established slavery, were not "republican," and must of necessity

be altered? Though the words "its existing laws" were ultimately left out of the clause, it was never intimated by any one that the then State constitutions were not "republican" because they sustained slavery. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, who said "that domestic slavery is the most prominent feature in the aristocratic countenance of the proposed Constitution," never pretended that it was not a *feature* of the Constitution of the United States itself; nor was there at that time a disposition manifested to place the blacks on an equal footing with the white race. The same Gouverneur Morris, in discussing the proposed basis of representation, said: "Another objection with him against admitting the blacks into the census was, that the people of Pennsylvania would revolt at the idea of being put on a footing with slaves." His colleague (Mr. Wilson) said: "He had some apprehensions, also, from the tendency of the blending of the blacks with the whites, to give disgust to the people of Pennsylvania, as had been intimated by his colleague," (Mr. Gouverneur Morris.) To show that similar feelings exist in the free States still, I might refer to the laws of Ohio excluding free negroes; to the extraordinary provision in the new Constitution of Illinois, to prevent free negroes from being admitted into the territory of that State; to the decision, the other day, of the State of Connecticut, by which the people determined, by a vote of four to one, that free blacks should not be allowed to vote. And, as I have alluded to that matter, I will say that I have no doubt but that the people decided that question aright. I may be told that no mischief has resulted in Massachusetts from permitting negroes to vote. And, sir, I have no doubt but that if, out of sympathy, all blind infants were allowed to vote, no political evil would have resulted, the number of either class being too small to disturb that prosperous commonwealth. Nor is it sufficient for me to hear it said that this or that particular negro is as intelligent and as moral as the average of white voters. It is easy to find females far better qualified to think justly on political subjects than most men, and sometimes we find those among them not averse to the bustle of an election day. Many young men of eighteen and twenty years of age are better politicians than other adult voters. Why is it, then, that all females are excluded from the right to vote? Why is it that, even among the other half of the human race, men are excluded from the right of suffrage till they have attained an age which the majority never reach? It is no answer, in the latter instance, to say that all have an equal chance to attain the age of twenty-one. So all men may become as rich as Girard or Astor; and you might, on the same principle, fix the property qualification of a voter at a million. You cannot deny that many of the excluded are qualified to exercise the right; but they are excluded simply because constitutions and laws decide upon general principles, and as *classes*, females and infants under twenty-one are presumed not to be as well qualified to vote as adult males. It is this principle which excludes the negro, because, as a *class*, they are *inferior* to the white race.

But, perhaps, I shall be arraigned in certain quarters as charging injustice upon Providence, when I assert that he has not made the capacities of the different races equal. And, forsooth, am I, because men are of necessity scattered all over the earth, there not being room for all in the temperate zones, lest I should arraign the justice of Providence, to

maintain that all parts of the earth have equal advantages of climate, soil, navigable streams, &c., and assert against the evidences of my senses that the climate of Siberia is as pleasant as that of Italy, and the deserts of Arabia as fertile as the valley of the Mississippi? He who admits that one individual has naturally greater bodily or mental powers than another is guilty of the same sort of impiety. The scripture itself teaches that, while ten talents are given to some, a single talent only is given to others. The difference in the races of men, as they have hitherto existed in the world, are so obvious as to have always arrested the attention of mankind. Whatever regret may be felt among any set of philanthropists, it cannot be denied that in the peninsula of India a population more than five times as great as that of the whole United States is easily kept in subjection by the superior courage and strength of a few Englishmen. The African races have been preyed upon by every invader from the earliest historic times—formerly by the Egyptians, the Carthaginians, the Romans and the Saracens; in our own day by the English at the south, and the French on the north. The American Indians afford another striking instance.

So great are the differences among races or nations of men, that they are observed readily by the most careless spectators, though they are often overlooked by legislators in framing constitutions of government, so that incalculable mischief is produced. Political systems have in all ages been made by wise men for those whose capacity was not sufficient to sustain them, and the ruins of which have been productive of misery. The condition of the Spanish race on this continent affords to our eyes a mournful illustration of this.

The total failure of the emancipation of the negroes in the West Indies to answer the expectations raised by the great care with which the British government effected the measure, is so striking an instance as to remind us of the benevolent attempt to change the color of the Moor, recorded in Æsop's fable. It was a profound observation of the most philosophical of human intellects that we can only govern Nature by obeying her laws. The force of this truth is acknowledged with reference to the daily transactions of men. They seek to avail themselves of the natural laws, and in building houses and ships, and in the various mechanic arts, have a due regard to the qualities of the different substances they may employ, and their liability to be affected by different agents. In framing, however, social and political systems, the principle announced by Bacon is disregarded and condemned frequently by legislators, who will not understand that Providence has established moral laws as determinate as those which govern the physical world, and who are astonished from time to time because, when acting in defiance of those laws, they cannot find the same results as if their conduct had been in accordance with them. I maintain, then, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Connecticut, in deciding that the negroes are not, as a *class*, capable of administering our complicated republican system of government, are sustained by the results of experience, observation, and sound philosophy.

I have, however, occupied more time on this part of my subject than I at first intended. My main object was to show what was meant by "republican form of government" in the Constitution; that it was not meant thereby to exclude slavery either from the States or Territories,

much less did it mean that sort of absolute political equality in all respects which has never existed as yet in any one of the States. The Constitution of the United States was made by men who had come chiefly from the middle and western parts of Europe, and who felt themselves under no obligations to extend its advantages to the negro race.

If then, sir, I am right in the view I take of the meaning of the phrase "republican constitution," Congress has no authority to object to the admission of any State because she tolerates slavery. The attempt to exclude Missouri because her constitution was like those of the old States was a gross usurpation. Congress has the *power* to refuse the admission of a State for that reason, just as she has the *power* to object to admission because the State does not tolerate slavery; but she has in either case *no right* under the Constitution.

Having thus, Mr. Chairman, glanced at some of the constitutional questions which have been in public discussions connected with this subject, I will ask the indulgence of the House while I consider another class of topics. It is said by some who object to the existence of slavery in the territories that may hereafter be acquired, that the representation of three-fifths of the slaves, as provided for in the Constitution, is wrong; that it gives the Southern States an undue advantage; and that, if new slave territories be added to the Union, it will increase the evil. Those who urge this objection, sir, would do well to recur sometimes to the circumstances under which that clause of the Constitution was adopted. In the debates of the Convention, Mr. Rufus King said he "had always expected that, as the Southern States are the richest, they would not league themselves with the Northern, unless some respect were paid to their superior wealth. If the latter expect those preferential distinctions in commerce, and other advantages which they will derive from the connection, they must not expect to receive them without allowing some advantages in return. Eleven of the thirteen States had agreed to consider slaves in the apportionment of taxation, and taxation and representation ought to go together." These preferential distinctions of commerce, and the other advantages anticipated by Mr. King, have been enjoyed by the North. Every candid man will admit that those powers of the Government have, for the last thirty years at least, been exercised to a greater extent than the men of that day seem to have regarded as practicable and desirable, and with even greater advantages to the North than they anticipated. For one, sir, I do not complain of this; but I do say that it is with no very good grace that those who participate in and still claim these benefits, should harp so much upon what they gave in exchange. But, Mr. Chairman, this consideration has, in a practical point of view, nothing to do with the subject of slavery in the territories. If slavery should be permitted to exist there, since the act of Congress forbids the importation of slaves after the year 1808 from any other country, none could be carried there except those that were taken from some of the United States. But those slaves are already counted and represented. It is obvious, therefore, that by transferring part of the slaves from the old States to the new, you would not increase their numbers. Being represented only in this House—the Senate, as all know, rests on a different basis—you would in no wise increase the slave representation by the addition of new slave States. Whatever was added to

their population by emigration from the old States, would to the same extent weaken the latter.

This view of the case is so obvious that, when I hear persons speaking of the "increase of slavery" and "strengthening the slave power," they must pardon me for questioning their sincerity. Nor can any one entertain serious apprehensions that the slave States will overpower the free, and control the action of the government. The free States are in the ascendancy in all the branches of the government, and their majority of more than fifty votes on this floor and in the electoral colleges is greater than they ever had in former times. This excess must be increased, too, hereafter—nine-tenths of the territory in the northwest being intended to be carved into free States, and being more than can be filled up for centuries to come, and those States increasing, as they do, faster in population than the slave States. This circumstance is sometimes referred to as evidence that the continuance of slavery is injurious to us as a nation. It may be remembered, however, that the view derived from the decennial census is well calculated to deceive. More than one hundred thousand foreigners annually arrive in the United States, who settle down almost entirely in the free States. Those who emigrate from the old Northern States almost all go to the new free States; while, on the other hand, a very large portion of the emigration of the old Southern States goes into the free States of the northwest. This, as I have observed myself, is eminently true of the North Carolina emigrants; and I may add, too, but for this emigration, population would increase in that State as fast as it could in any country, there being an abundant supply of the necessaries of life among the entire population. Nor does the condition of the negro population retard its increase. The opinions of Malthus and other writers, that slavery is unfavorable to an increase of population, are probably founded on observations of such as live in cities, and are used as domestics. Appian's authority is decisive as to the rapid multiplication of slaves employed in the agricultural districts of the Roman empire. This accords with our experience in the United States. The physical wants of the slave are sure of being provided for, because he can never be owned by a pauper. It is due to truth, too, to state that the negro race in the Southern States, when considered with reference to their physical comforts, industry and moral qualities, are in advance of the same race either in Africa or in the Northern States. I am ready to admit, sir, that the Southern States would be more prosperous, as a whole, if filled up with such a population as the freemen of this Union. The white race being superior to the black, of course a country filled with the former is more vigorous and prosperous than one filled with a mixed race. That, however, is not the question to be settled. The abolitionist must show that these very negroes, if set free, would be more productive as laborers, and more manageable as citizens, than they now are. Before they can accomplish this they must, however, account in some satisfactory manner for their inferior condition, not only in Africa, but where they have been liberated in the West Indies and in the Northern States. As we have the negro race in the country, and cannot get rid of them, the true question is, whether they can be better disposed of in any other mode. Whatever evils may be attendant on

the condition of slavery, will be rather aggravated by crowding them together in a few States.

Again, sir, popular appeals are made from time to time, by abolitionists and others, to arouse the prejudices of the North against the competition of slave labor. These men ought to know that liberating the slaves would produce the very evils they complain of. The free blacks of the North, not to speak of the Irish and other emigrants, have done much more to reduce the wages of labor at the North than the slaves, occupied as they are chiefly in the cotton, sugar, rice, and tobacco fields of the South.

Others say that slavery must not be extended to any new territory, because the Constitution provides for the calling out of the militia to suppress insurrections, and therefore they express immense terror lest they should be obliged to aid in suppressing slave insurrections. When they shall in some one instance be required to turn out for this purpose, if they should find the burden more intolerable than the other requisitions of the Constitution, they will doubtless then have good grounds for asking such an amendment as may relieve them from this onerous imposition. It is not, however, at all likely that any insurrection will occur sufficiently extensive to give time for the coming of persons from other States to suppress it.

Much of the agitation, sir, which the country has undergone in relation to this subject, is due to the action of anti-slavery or abolition societies. Such societies have existed since the foundation of the government, though, for reasons which I may presently allude to, their influence has been greater for a dozen years past than formerly. Those societies are composed of a variety of elements. There are in them conscientious and benevolent men, who feel it to be their duty to exterminate some one evil, and who have selected this as the object of their exertions. With them are a class who externally seem to resemble them, but who may be better described in the humorous lines from *Hudibras*, as those

“Who compound for sins they are inclined to,
By damning those they have no mind to.”

Like the Pharisees of old, they are seen publicly giving thanks that they are not as the publicans and sinners of the South. In a country like this, too, where the general diffusion of education produces many competitors for each prize, men of ambition and second rate talents, finding the high roads to eminence occupied by their superiors, go in search of new paths to distinction. Some of them have sought notoriety and popularity by preaching up a crusade against Southern slavery. There is still a fourth class—consisting of those who are determined to live off the public—who have selected this as a humbug by which to inflame the popular passions and obtain money by cheating the confiding and credulous. They are as unscrupulous about the means they employ as was the impostor Mokanna, who to cloak his hypocrisy and deceive his followers, on his banner

“Unfurled
Those words of sunshine, Freedom to the world!”

As the societies are, therefore, composed chiefly of those who design to deceive, and of persons of an imaginative cast of mind, who naturally shrink from examining facts, and are easily led away by their impulses, it is not strange that the matters published by them should contain all manner of absurdities. Works of pure fiction are written, the most glaring falsehoods or misrepresentations published and circulated, and incorporated into their standard works. When one sees the materials they have to work with, he is not surprised at the conclusions to which they come. It is as if one were to attempt to build up a system of philosophy upon the facts stated in the History of Amadis of Gaul, or the Arabian Nights Entertainments.

What strikes the observer most, perhaps, is the wonderful diversity in doctrine which is exhibited by these societies. Bacon says that, "if men were all to become even uniformly mad, they might agree tolerably well with each other." This has been exemplified by some sects of fanatics. Unfortunately, however, for the abolition society as a whole, its members are not *uniformly mad*, and hence, they *disagree most intolerably*. Even in their national conventions of delegates you have nothing but the "whirl and confusion of argument." Its jarring elements remind one of the struggles of Chance and Tumult in the reign of ancient Night, when Chaos sat as umpire, "and by decision more embroiled the fray." It might be supposed that their collisions would be the means of correcting their errors, but they seem to be in the condition of the Schoolmen, who because they built upon the errors and logical fallacies of their master, Aristotle, argued with each other for two thousand years without ever ascertaining any one truth. The society, however, seems likely to split into two grand divisions, Mr. Lysander Spooner, who just now appears to be at the head of one, publishes a book to *prove* slavery *unconstitutional*. Mr. Spooner shows, in the first place, that all constitutions and laws which are unjust, are in themselves totally void, and that all judges, howsoever appointed, are bound so to decide. Having established clearly this proposition, he admits that he need not go any further. To show his ingenuity, however, he says he will waive that for the present, and then goes on and proves, secondly, that slavery never had any legal existence in any of the colonies; thirdly, that, if it had legally existed, the Declaration of Independence abolished it; fourthly, he proves that slavery had no existence, legally, under any of the State constitutions; but that, fifthly, even if it had, the Constitution of the United States, when adopted, abolished it. These, and many other propositions, he establishes. In fact, he proves every thing he attempts, without the slightest difficulty, except that a woman cannot be President of the United States. This point, after a learned disquisition and much argumentation, he admits is not free from doubt, and he thereupon leaves the matter in a great fog. This book, being something new had a wonderful run, and the abolitionists collected around Mr. Spooner and applauded him, until he began to think that he had at length carried off the "gates of Gaza." In an unlucky hour, however, for Mr. Spooner, and his book which seemed to be spreading itself like a "green bay tree," they both fell into the hands of Mr. Wendell Phillips, an abolitionist of the old

Garrison or disunion school. Not being willing, as he says, that the multitude should go off after this new light, and seemingly not a little pleased to have a man of straw made to his hand, he, with a great display of legal learning, strong argument, and sharp sarcasm, cuts Mr. Spooner to pieces, to the great terror of his followers—proving beyond dispute that slavery is constitutional, and that therefore the Constitution must be destroyed before it can be reached. It is in vain that Mr. Spooner complainingly says, that if the people believe slavery constitutional, they will not be so ready to abolish it, and says, with commendable simplicity, that if every body would believe it *unconstitutional*, it could be easily abolished, and that no good anti-slavery man ought to attack his book. Mr. Phillips asks him in turn, whether he is *serious himself* in entertaining such opinions, and in believing that the community will ever adopt them, and soothingly tells him that it is a small matter that divides them, the only difficulty being whether they shall go against slavery *under* the Constitution or *over* it. The society, however, being thrown into confusion by the dissensions of its leaders, and at a stand from doubt as to which of these roads it shall travel, seemed at the last accounts in a perishing condition.

Notwithstanding all the efforts of the abolition societies for a number of years, they have, as such, been able to effect very little mischief. Their schemes were always either so absurd and visionary, or so reckless of consequences to the well-being of society, that they have been successfully combated by the good sense and proper feeling of the North; so that, at most, they have but served as scare-crows for the use of popular declaimers. The question of slavery has, however, assumed a grave and momentous cast, from the attempt to connect it with the party politics of the day. In a country like this, political parties will always exist; nor is it, perhaps, desirable that they should be eradicated, even if it were practicable, which every man of reflection sees to be impossible. As to the successful administration of our system, however, everything depends on the manner in which those parties are constituted. Unquestionably, the safest and best parties are those based upon differences of opinion as to the mode of administering the government, and as to the measures it should carry out; not only because such parties, having a direct reference to the action of the government generally, have a tendency to diffuse correct political information among the people at large, whose will must in the end govern every thing, but especially because such is the nature of the human mind that such parties will have members in every class of society and every section of the country. States, counties, neighborhoods, and even families are divided, and the minorities as well as the majorities, in their zeal to defend their views and make converts out of opponents, diffuse in every section correct notions as to their respective opinions; so that, by this interchange of sentiment, produced by a collision ramifying itself into every portion of the community, the excitement is kept within due bounds, and both parties are satisfied as to the honesty and patriotism of their opponents, as classes, and are rendered tolerant and liberal in their intercourse with each other. When an election has terminated, the minority acquiesces

quietly, because that result seems to have been produced by an honest difference of opinion as to the measures of the government. If, however, the division should be a social one, or one of classes of society, as for example, of the poor against the rich, then the results are somewhat different.

In the first place, the appeal in such cases not being to the *reason*, but only to the feelings of men, their passions are easily excited to a high pitch, and they are prone to resort to violent extremes. Those, too, who are disappointed, feel that they have been beaten, not because of their demerit, but because of the class to which they belong; that instead of having an equal share of what is, in theory, common property, they have been unjustly excluded, and they are thus rendered desperate, and determine to break up a system which oppresses them. But of all parties which can exist in a republic, perhaps in any country, the most dangerous to the well-being of the State are sectional ones, or those founded on geographical distinctions. It is natural for men to feel strongly attached to the land in which they live. Hence they are prompted to take the side of their own country in all collisions between nations; and the same is equally true when the contest is between different sections of the same country. Every man feels that what he most values in the world is connected with the section of country in which he lives; and hence when that section, as a whole, is arrayed against any other, it is but natural that his strongest and deepest feelings should be aroused; and injustice and injury done to that section, he regards as done to himself and all that he most values. In party contests, too, of a sectional character, each section is driven to greater extremes of feeling, from not understanding properly the views of opponents. A few violent men take the lead and represent the views of another set of men equally violent like themselves, of the opposite party, however, as constituting the views of that party as a whole, and each faction is thus excited by the supposed violence of the other. Reflecting, moderate men often shrink from expressing different views, lest they should be charged with hostility to their own section of country, and by consequence the most rash and worthless demagogues of each section have the guidance of affairs. Hence it has invariably happened that when considerable sections of country have been arrayed against each other upon questions giving rise to much excitement, such divisions have invariably broken to pieces all such political systems as the human intellect has been able to devise. These views were not overlooked by the founders of our government; and General Washington warned the American people, in most emphatic language, to "beware of parties founded on geographical distinctions." In the debates, too, of the convention which made the Constitution, apprehension was felt and expressed from this quarter. It was feared by some that the three large States might combine against the smaller; that the Western States, when they became populous and strong, might be arrayed against the Atlantic States, and that there might be found too great a diversity of interest between the planting States of the South and the commercial ones of the North. Though attempts have been made from time to time by demagogues to get up parties

upon some of these questions, yet the good sense of our people has successfully resisted them. Our party divisions, on the contrary, have been of a different character, and every great party has numbered among its members men of all classes and pursuits, as well as of all sections of country. This is eminently true as we now witness them, there being in almost every State and district of the Union large and powerful minorities of one or the other party, embracing men of every variety of occupation and standing socially. And in looking back for more than a dozen years to the excited elections which the country has gone through, it will be found that, in the national contests, the candidate who triumphed received majorities in both of the great sections of the Union. Owing to these circumstances, the country has experienced no serious evil from the great political excitement it has at times undergone. Neighbors, friends and relatives being divided thus, they have been tolerant towards each other. But if, on the contrary, the parties of 1840 or 1844 had been identified with particular geographical lines, it may well be doubted if our institutions would have stood the shock, and whether the minority would in each case have submitted quietly.

More than one serious attempt has been made, Mr. Chairman, to connect the question of slavery with the party politics of the country. That which had its origin when Missouri applied for admission into the Union, is well known. That State had made for herself just such a republican constitution as existed in twelve of the original thirteen States at the time they entered into the Union under the Constitution—just such a form of government as then existed in half the States. Congress, therefore, as I have shown, had no authority whatever to refuse her admission. Nor was there even a well-founded pretext for the opposition raised, since the slaves she held had been taken from the other States, in which they had previously been counted and represented. Nor was their number as great as, at the time of her adoption into the Union, had existed in Louisiana, another State made out of the same territory which had been obtained from France. There was obviously no justifiable ground on which to exclude her. Some of the politicians, however, tired of being in a minority, and seeing that the free States had a majority in the electoral colleges and in the House of Representatives, and that, if they could be induced all to act together, they would be able to control the national elections, seized upon that occasion to endeavor to promote a sectional division between the North and the South, and thereby build up a political party in the North strong enough to carry the Presidential election. The fearful agitation which the country then underwent, caused many to apprehend that the days of our united existence were numbered. There was, however, a settlement made at length, upon terms which, though unequal to the South, were not at variance with the spirit of the Constitution.

The next effort to connect this question with party politics, I am, as a Southern man, Mr. Chairman, sorry to be compelled to say, came from the South. In speaking of this and some subsequent events, I regret to feel obliged to allude to matters, connected to some extent

with political movements of our own day. I shall not, however, speak of these things as a partisan. I do not intend to make a single remark offensive to any friend of the existing Constitution of the United States. I shall only allude to such great facts as are necessary to be seen to enable the public to form a correct judgment in relation to the question. This is due to truth, and to the magnitude of the issues at stake; and I intend, as far as I am able, to do *justice* to the question. The Southern States, being in the minority, were not able to make any successful aggressive attacks upon the North in relation to this subject. Their true position was simply one of defence, and the guaranties of the Constitution, and the just sentiments of the body of the people at the North, were amply sufficient to enable us to sustain that position.

After the unpleasant difficulty growing out of Nullification had been satisfactorily settled, there was a general disposition both at the South and in the North to bury all sectional and local ill feelings and differences. Unfortunately, however, for the repose of the country, Mr. Calhoun, who had been a prominent actor on the side of nullification, found himself uncomfortable in his then position. The majorities of every one of the Southern States were not only opposed to him politically, but viewed him with suspicion and distrust. Being ambitious of popularity and influence, he sought to restore himself to the confidence of the South in the first place, and seized upon the slave question as the means to effect that end. He professed to feel great dread lest the North should take steps in contravention of our rights, and to desire only to put the South on her guard against the imminent danger which was threatening her. He only wished to produce agitation enough to unite the South, though everybody well knew that there was, in relation to this subject, no division *there*. Whether he had ulterior views against the integrity of the Union, it is not my purpose to inquire; I am only looking at *acts*, not inquiring into *motives*. The former obviously looked to the creation of a political party based on the slavery question.

The United States *Telegraph*, edited by General Green, shorn of its former strength and influence, was then only known as his organ. Immediately after the adjournment of Congress, on the 4th of March, 1833, that Congress which, by the compromise law, had put an end to the painful excitement growing out of nullification, when there was a general disposition throughout the land to enjoy repose from internal agitation, the editor of that paper began the publication of a series of inflammatory articles. He called upon the "South to awake, to arouse to a sense of her danger." The North, he said, had arisen to invade the institutions of the South. Under the new principles of the then administration, he said that they were preparing to liberate the slaves. He searched the whole country over, and republished every abolition document and frothy incendiary paragraph he could find. He declared that the whole North was unsound, and preparing itself for a crusade against us. Column after column of this sort daily came out, containing the most offensive matter which he could invent and publish. Those Southern papers which refused to echo his views he denounced as "collar presses." The Richmond *Enquirer*, of the same political party, in

June of that year, uses this language: "The United States *Telegraph* charges us with abandoning the cause of the South, because we do not cry out wof upon the question of slavery. This is folly, or it is falsehood. We do not declaim about slavery because we cannot believe that the citizens of the North are mad enough to trench upon our rights." The *Pennsylvanian*, of the same political party, from the North, uses this emphatic language: "The conduct of the United States *Telegraph* in relation to the slavery of the South is incomprehensible. Day after day that incendiary print is endeavoring to stimulate an excitement on this fearful topic, by representing the despicable journals of a few fanatics in New York and Boston as the emanations of the late patriotic proclamation of our venerable President. The *Telegraph* professes to be friendly to the South, to have the especial management of her cause, and yet its course appears only to be calculated to stir up such horrible scenes as the Southampton tragedy, or to awaken the slumbering sensibilities of the North to the great, original, momentous, and fearful questions of slavery and liberty. Does the *Telegraph*, in its insane paroxysm, want to open this dreadful question? Does it want to unsettle the Constitution and spread a conflagration through society?"

Such language brought from the *Telegraph* only gross insults. In the paper of June 15th he says: "We ask the people of the South why is it that the Northern politicians are so fond of the *Union*? Is it not because they desire to *profit* from it?" Sometimes his language betrays his real object. In the number of June 8th he says: "We say to the people of the South, awake! The incendiary is abroad! The Union is in danger! Already has the ban of empire gone forth against your best and wisest statesmen! Fidelity to you is political death to them! Treason to you is the surest passport to federal promotion! Is it wise, is it safe, is it honorable to sleep over such wrongs?" His principal had then, but recently, too, declared in his speech of the preceding session that henceforth every Southern man was to be excluded from office. Such declarations were made by these co-laborers at a time when a Southern slaveholder had just been inducted into office a second time with an immense vote at the North, and when the South had as large a share of the offices of the government and as much influence in the Union as it ever had. But simply because Mr. Calhoun was excluded from office the South was oppressed and degraded. A few satellites echoed these things, but the press and people generally at the South expressed disapproval of and disgust with such proceedings. I will venture the assertion, in which I appeal to the candor of all Southern men to sustain me, that out of the State of South Carolina, as to which I do not profess to speak, Mr. Calhoun was not sustained in any one State in this Union, by five per cent. of the population. In fact his strength at the South was about as great as that of the Abolitionists at the North. His violence or denunciation was food for the Abolitionists just as their fanaticism gave him materials to work with.

The South, generally, had not chosen him to defend her, and viewed his efforts in her behalf as *mala fide*. Though he might state prin-

ciples that she approved, she would not trust the man or follow his lead, and he had the mortification of finding that he added nothing to his influence or popularity. When these occurrences began, the people of the North, not understanding the game that was to be played, seemed surprised. They declared that the South was too timid and too sensitive on the question; that there was no danger to be apprehended from the machinations of the Abolitionists; and that their movements were condemned by ninety-nine out of every hundred of the citizens of the free States. If it were not, sir, for consuming too much time of the House, I might refer to published letters and speeches of the first men all through the North. Intelligent Southern men, too, who traveled through the Northern States, declared the same thing. Large meetings were gotten up in all the Northern cities, in which the abolition movements were denounced in the most emphatic manner. Many remember the meeting at Boston, at which Otis made that noble and most eloquent speech. Strong demonstrations were made all through the North. The persons of the Abolitionists, as being common disturbers of the public peace, suffered violence, and the houses where they held their meetings were burnt. All these things, so far from diminishing the factitious excitement gotten up in the South, seemed to have produced the greatest irritation, the "*Telegraph*" becoming more furious than ever, and denouncing the Northern men generally as false-hearted, and hypocritical and "*dough-faced*." Such returns seemed to chill a little the generous enthusiasm of the North. The great body of the Southern people being quiet and silent, they did not know how much these incendiary efforts were contemned and despised at the South generally. These attempts, however, were persisted in for two or three years; and, though they did produce some ill-feeling between the different sections of the country, and weakened the position of the South essentially, and seriously diminished her influence in the Union, yet the efforts so far failed to answer any present purpose which the actors had in view, that the attempts were finally abandoned, in the main.

There was, however, a *feeble* effort to connect the slavery question with the presidential election in 1836. Mr. Van Buren, a Northern man, was opposed by a candidate in the South, and these persons, having at that particular time strong objections to the former, and wishing to unite the South, represented him as being an Abolitionist; in making which charge they were joined by some of the party presses and party men of that day. The charge was so glaringly unjust that it was easily refuted, and Mr. Van Buren received even at the South a larger vote than did his Southern competitor. In the succeeding election, in 1840, some of these persons, having changed sides, and gone from one of the great political parties over to the other, seeing that they had not been able to prove Mr. Van Buren an Abolitionist, endeavored to show that his opponent at least was one. In this effort they failed as signally as in the former one; and General Harrison's views being soon well known, he received a much larger vote at the South than did his competitor. By a sort of fatality it seemed that

these persons killed off what they embraced, just as the abolitionism of the North has destroyed what it has fixed upon.

A passing notice is perhaps due, Mr. Chairman, to the last Democratic Baltimore Convention. A great effort has been made in some portions of the North to create a strong prejudice against the South on account of some of the doings of that convention. The "slave power" is denounced as having overthrown a great Northern statesman, viz., Mr. Van Buren, by the two-thirds rule; and a strong attempt is made to excite his old personal friends against the South. And it is not a little singular that some who assisted in his rejection are now making the charge. To those who were acquainted with those proceedings nothing could seem more absurd, and even ridiculous, than such a charge. In that convention the free States had a majority of fifty votes, and the convention, by a simple majority vote, agreed on its rules of order and mode of voting. This was done, too, after weeks of discussion in the public prints, when the effects both of majority and two-thirds votes were canvassed and perfectly understood. It is well known that a majority of the leading politicians of the party had come to the conclusion, after the results of the spring elections in Connecticut and Virginia, that Mr. Van Buren's nomination would be fatal to his party; and, as a great many delegates had been instructed in meetings during the winter and fall before to vote for him, it was deemed most politic and expedient to exclude him, simply by adopting the two-thirds rule. For its adoption the "slave power" of the South is no more responsible than the free power of the North, as the voting shows. After the convention, I was told by a Democratic member of Congress, himself an actor in those scenes, that they had, even in the event of the two-thirds rule being not adopted, a sufficient number pledged to defeat Mr. Van Buren on a mere majority vote, should it have become necessary for them to take the responsibility of so doing. Nor am I sure that Mr. Van Buren's Texas letter had any decided influence against him. Knowing, as I did, how many of the leading politicians of the party stood either for or against him, I cannot remember a single one who changed his ground after the publication of his letter.

The prospect, now, however, Mr. Chairman, that territory may be acquired, and the chance of getting up a practical issue on these questions, has opened a wide field for political excitement. An extraordinary effort is being made in certain quarters to create strong sectional feeling. Those who have taken the lead in the matter declaim against the extension of slavery, though they well know that if new territory should be opened to slaves, as none could reach it except from the present slave States, the numbers of such persons in the Union could not be increased. They complain vehemently of the slave representation, and say it shall not be increased; yet they well know that the whole slave population is already counted, and represented both in this House and in the electoral colleges, and that no addition would be made to that representation by simply dividing the population. They denounce, too, the "slave power," and say that the South is seeking to control the government, though they well know

that the free States have the ascendancy in both Houses, and a large majority in the electoral colleges; and that under the arrangements made nine-tenths at least of the territory of the United States will be, as it comes into the Union, carved into free States. They talk much of the evils of slavery, yet they know that if the number of slaves be not increased, the disadvantages attending the system are rather diminished than increased, by diffusing it over a large surface. These various objections, being obviously mere pretexts, would not of themselves make sufficient impression on the public mind at the North to produce much excitement. But a great appeal is made to the prejudice of the ignorant. They are told that a slaveholder has three votes for every five slaves; forgetting, however, that all the free negroes are counted, and that, therefore, white men, in most of the Northern States, where negroes are not allowed to vote, have, upon this principle, five votes to the Southern man's three; and those of them who clamor for emancipation should remember that, if all the Southern slaves were liberated, the South would be a gainer of two-fifths in strength, and still none of the negroes would be permitted to vote, the Constitution leaving that matter altogether to the States, and nearly all of them in the Union excluding free negroes from voting. To excite the public mind, too, demagogues talk about the rights of free labor and the degradation of slave labor, and say that its competition must not be suffered. They do not pretend that a freeman cannot work as much because he knows that there are slaves at work somewhere else, and they should certainly know that the competition of slave labor, as it is now employed, is much less injurious to the North than it would be if these slaves were liberated. They have even now much stronger inducements to seek the expulsion of the free blacks and the exclusion of the Irish and other foreigners, the influx of whom diminish wages. They are striving, too, to excite the prejudices of the envious and mean against the exclusive privileges of slave holders. I mean, sir, that class of persons (I hope a small one) which is sometimes arrayed against land-owners, and occasionally clamor for agrarian laws and divisions of property. They denounce Southern men as man-stealers, slave-dealers, &c., not choosing to remember that almost all the slaves of the South were originally bought of Northern ship-owners, who brought them to the United States, and sold them to us. They should know that they are under just as great obligations to return to us the purchase money which our ancestors paid theirs, as we are under to give up the slaves. "The present generation is no more responsible for slavery than it is for the existence of swamps and pine barrens." I use the words of Harrison Gray Otis, of Boston, a name which deserves to be remembered wherever intellect and worth have fame.

Men at the North are now saying, as it was said by Duff Green in 1833: "The time has come; the issue must be met." They quote the language of men at the South as violent as themselves, with a view of stimulating as much as possible the passions of their own people. The Abolitionists of the North and the ultras at the South have united in lamenting the existence of political parties, which they say prevents

men's making a direct issue on slavery. But for this obstacle they say that the two sections of the Union could be arrayed in anger against each other. Do they not see that such a state of things would at once break in twain this confederacy? They, however, are not afraid! They taunt each other on both sides and boast of their courage! Sir, from my limited knowledge of human nature, I have found that persons who were most indifferent to public calamities, and who were most reckless in plunging others into danger when in personal peril, invariably proved themselves *craven cowards*. True courage, because of the generous qualities which usually accompany it, makes men careful of the public safety and causes them to shrink from exposing others to peril. These boasters, therefore, would do well to remember that they are furnishing to the world *prima facie* evidence of their own poltroonery. Whenever, Mr. Chairman, you see political parties divided by strict geographical lines the Union is virtually at an end, because the smaller section, *seeing* it was permanently excluded from all share in those political rights which should be common to all, would be justified in seeking, and no doubt *would* seek, a new system.

There are those who are now looking to a destruction of the present Constitution. To show the sentiments of some of those who are most clamorous against the extension of slavery, let me bring to the attention of the House certain extracts. I read them, sir, as they have been collated by Mr. Nathan Appleton, who, I need not say to this House, is one of the first men not only of New England but of the United States. Because he expressed sentiments of regard for the Constitution and the Union, and a determination to abide by the laws as made, a torrent of obloquy was directed against him, so as to oblige him to publish a pamphlet in his defence.

But I come to the extracts which he thought it proper to make to show the opinions of his assailants, many of them persons of no mean capacity or standing at home. I will read but a few of the sentiments collected by him from various quarters: "Accursed be the American Union as a stupendous republican imposture! Accursed be it, as a libel on democracy and a bold assault on Christianity! Accursed be it; it is stained with human blood and supported by human sacrifices! Accursed be it for all the crimes it has committed at home—for seeking the utter extermination of the red men of its wildernesses, and for enslaving one-sixth part of its teeming population! Accursed be it for its hypocrisy, its falsehood, its impudence, its lust, its cruelty, its oppression! Accursed be it as a mighty obstacle in the way of universal freedom and equality! Henceforth the watchword of every uncompromising Abolitionist, of every friend of God and liberty, must be, both in a religious and political sense, *no union with slave-holders!*"

This last sentiment he shows has been adopted as a motto by many who do not profess to belong to the sect of abolitionists. Others less open and candid profess more regard for the Constitution, which they say has been always trampled under foot by the "slave power." A stranger to our history, hearing the sentiments which are uttered in many quarters, would naturally suppose that the United States was

the worst governed country on earth, and that the Northern section had borne most of the evil and was the most miserable portion of it.

In the debates of the convention which framed the Constitution, apprehension was expressed that the three large States might combine against the smaller ones. Mr. Madison, in reply, said that no danger need be apprehended on that account, because such was the diversity of interest between these three large States that they could not combine. The staple of Virginia, he said, was tobacco; that of Pennsylvania was flour, and of Massachusetts FISH. The staple of Massachusetts *then* was *fish*. What are *now* her staples? New York, then a little State, dreading a close alliance with her great neighbors—look at her to-day! Pennsylvania, whose representative, Gouverneur Morris, spoke contemptuously of the New England States in comparison with the middle ones, especially his own, she, sir, notwithstanding a progress which none of her sons at that day anticipated, finds herself in danger of being passed by Ohio, a State not then in existence—a creation of the Constitution itself. But the South, under whose control and for whose benefit it is pretended the entire powers of the government have been exercised, though she has made no inconsiderable progress, yet, in comparison with the North, she seems to have retrograded. So striking is the disparity, that the Abolitionists are constantly asserting that the South is too feeble to uphold slavery herself, and that, if the protection which the Constitution of the United States gives were withdrawn, slavery would fall of itself.

That great disadvantages would result, Mr. Chairman, from the destruction of the Constitution, I am the last man to doubt. The evils of such a catastrophe are so great that I could not conceal them if I would, and I would not conceal them if I could. But, sir, it may well be questioned whether the calamities which it would bring would fall more heavily on us than upon others. Though the slave States are not equal to the free in population and wealth, yet the strength they have is amply sufficient for purposes of defence, either as against the North or against foreign nations. In fact, I might say with truth that the smallest republican States that have ever existed in the world, as long as they were actuated by a determined spirit, have successfully resisted invasion. Not only is the population of the South, and its extent of territory, amply sufficient for present purposes, but its chance of extending its dominions would be better than that of the free States, since we have on our southern border a feeble neighbor, while Great Britain would most probably be able to protect her colonies on the northern border of the Union. Though we have little of commercial and manufacturing wealth, yet the tariff and navigation laws which we should establish by excluding the competition of the North would soon give us both. This, and the aversion to going into what would then be a foreign, most probably a hostile country, would keep our population at home. And since the States south of the Ohio river, on both sides of the Mississippi, are quite strong enough to hold that territory, it might well be doubted if the new States on its upper waters would not find powerful inducements to unite their political with their commercial interest. But we are denounced for our bad morals, and sneered at for our weakness, from

time to time. A recent publication says, "traitors to freedom at heart, as the slave interest ever was," &c. We shall be content to exhibit to the world such morals as those of John Marshall, William Gaston, and a thousand others that I might name; such devotion to freedom as Henry, and Jefferson, and Madison, and Davie, and Rutledge exhibited; with as much courage to defend it as Washington and the old thirteen slave States manifested in their day—such as our citizens showed since in the defence of Baltimore and New Orleans, and such as has been exhibited on the battle-fields of Mexico by the regiments from Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and South Carolina. As I have had occasion to speak rather unkindly of some of the sons of the latter State, you will pardon me, sir, for adding that an intimate acquaintance with her citizens enables me to say that there are none elsewhere more generous, liberal, frank and brave. And the late Colonel Butler—I knew him well—when he died, left nowhere a nobler soldier to defend the flag of his country.

What, Mr. Chairman, is to be the result of these attempts on the part of the North? I do not allude to interference with slavery, as it exists in the States and Territories. No sane man imagines for a moment that any action of Congress could have any other effect, except to liberate such fugitive slaves as might escape over the lines after a dissolution of the Union. But, sir, what is to be the effect of this action, if carried out, in relation to territory to be hereafter acquired? I do not pretend that any section of the Union can insist fairly that territory should be acquired for her benefit. We are, doubtless, all bound in good faith to adhere to the Constitution and Union with such boundaries as it had when we became parties to it. But I do say, that if the government should acquire territory, it takes it under the Constitution for the benefit of all, and a decree that any section or its citizens shall be excluded from *all* such territory, would be as great a violation of the Constitution as the government could possibly commit. Such is substantially this proposed exclusion of slavery from *all territories hereafter to be acquired*. Will the slave States acquiesce in this state of things; or would they suppose that a government which was capable of this would not stop short of inflicting any other wrong? Would they ever acquiesce in this radical change of the Constitution—a change, the leading object and effect of which would be to degrade them from their present position of equality?

Rufus King, of Massachusetts, said, in the debates of the convention, when the subject of slave representation was under consideration, in allusion to the position of the Southern States: "If they threaten to separate now, in case injury shall be done them, will their threats be less urgent or effectual when force shall back their demands? Even in the intervening period there will be no point of time at which they will not be able to say, Do us justice or we will separate." What will they do in this emergency? It is a most unseasonable time for you to expect us to acquiesce in such a decree of political and social degradation, now, when some of the best blood of the South has been poured out like water on that territory. I will not, sir, undertake to tell you what they will do, because I have not been commissioned by them to announce their purposes, and I would not wish to be the first to announce painful

intelligence to your ears. You, Mr. Chairman, can judge of this as well as I. You remember when Great Britain claimed theoretically supremacy over the colonies, what those thirteen *slave-holding* colonies did. Do you suppose that the enjoyment of liberty for more than sixty years has rendered us indifferent to its sweets; or, if you please, that domination for that period over our slaves has made us willing to change places with them? Though I will not attempt to tell you what the Southern States will do, yet, sir, it is my privilege, as a republican and a freeman, to disclose frankly my own purpose.

I am for maintaining our present Constitution of government as long as any amount of human exertion can uphold it. Whatever of courage and patriotism induces the hardy mountaineer of Switzerland or Circassia, to struggle for ages against the sword of the invader in defence of the snowy mountains which shelter him—whatever an Athenian felt due to liberty on the plain of Marathon, or the Spartan king owed to his country when he devoted himself to death at Thermopylæ—this, and more than all this, I hold to be due from every American citizen to the Constitution of his country. But when a great organic change is made in that Constitution—a change which is to degrade those who have sent me to represent them here—then, sir, at whatever cost of feeling or of personal hazard, I will stand by the white race, the freemen of the South. Should we be forced away, we will control as we best can the inferior race which Providence has placed under our charge. We shall deal better by them than England does with her Irish or East Indian population. We may not find it safe to impart to them the highest degree of intellectual culture, even if they were capable of receiving it. Many of the Roman slaves were learned in physic and other sciences, but when it was proposed to distinguish the slaves by a peculiar dress, the sagacious Senate refused, fearing thus to teach them their great superiority of numbers. Nature has given our slaves a garb which distinguishes them from us, and places a barrier to social and political equality. Should they by these or other causes be driven to insurrections, we may be forced to destroy many of them, as Rome did in her servile wars. It is hardly possible that any contingency will render it necessary for the white race, in its own defence, to exterminate them, as the New Englanders did the Pequod and other Indian tribes, whom they found in their way on that territory. But, happen what may, we shall never be degraded to the level of such liberty and equality as prevails in Mexico, much less reduced to the condition of St. Domingo. The North, if she is not satisfied with the present Constitution, may go on in search of such a system as has never yet existed. She may go on with her *progressive democracy*, as Rome did after the days of the Gracchi; she may go on till she finds such equality as prevailed in France when Mirabeau was an orator, and Robespierre a magistrate. Whether she will then find a Cesar or a Napoleon, or whether she will move on into some new Utopian fields of liberty, time only can disclose.

It would be vain, however, for us on either side to hope for such prosperity as we have hitherto enjoyed. If the stream of our national existence should be divided, each branch must roll a diminished volume, and would be able only to bear a lesser burden. Such a separation would be the saddest of all partings. We should feel that our way was

lonely, like that of Hagar in the desert—desolate as the wanderings of our first parents when crime had just begun. Like the exile of Bolingbroke, we should have the same revolution of the seasons, the same sun and moon, and azure vault and rolling planets above our heads, but not the same mind and the same feelings. The vast constitutional edifice reared by our ancestors, and which they fondly hoped would stand like those marvelous eastern pyramids, the monuments of forty centuries, would, like the fabled palace of Aladdin, have melted away in the mists of the morning. It would be difficult and most painful to realize our new situation. Our fleets and armies in other lands would find themselves suddenly divided into aliens, possibly enemies to each other. When the veteran Scott should chance to cross my path, am I, because he is a resident of a free State, to gaze on him only as I would on Wellington or Soult? If the gallant Worth should come in my way, shall I not take him by the hand as a *countryman*? If Taylor should go to the North, will he be regarded as an alien? And those that stood under him at Buena Vista—are Lincoln, and Hardin, to be separated from Clay, and McKee, and Yell, by whose sides they lived and died in defence of the banner of a common country?

Great, however, as are the perils which beset us, we have powerful allies to resist them. After the adjustment of the painful difficulty in the days of nullification was known in France, Lafayette, the friend of America, who had looked on with intense anxiety, on the first public occasion gave as a sentiment, “the good sense of the American people, which enabled them wisely to settle all domestic difficulties.” We have abroad, among our people, a mass of strong, clear good sense, which in times of trial and danger has always sustained and controlled the action of the government. We have a community of interest, which it would seem that no party madness could break up. We have, too, recollections of the past, which to American feelings are stronger even than calculations of interest. Our immediate ancestors, in the establishment of our independence, and in the creation of this Constitution, performed such deeds as the world never saw; and we have fresh in our minds the recollections of their common counsels, common sufferings, common struggles, and common triumphs. There are Adams and Jefferson in counsel together; there are Bunker Hill and Yorktown; there the blood of Warren, and Montgomery, and Pulaski, and De Kalb; the genius of Franklin, and the great name of Washington; the daring of Paul Jones and Decatur, on the broad blue water, and the dying words of Lawrence. These recollections of the mighty dead stand, like giants of the olden time, to defend *their Constitution*. If, with all these proud recollections of the past, and such anticipations for the future as *never* a nation had, we can destroy this bond of Union, then we shall deserve a position as low as it may otherwise be high.

NOTE.

Though individuals might commend a speech like this, yet such was the state of feeling then existing in the country that neither appeal nor argument could produce any material change in the action of parties.

That portion of the Whig party in the North, which cherished the views of the old federalists, in favor of a strong central government, as a means

of obtaining pecuniary advantages over the Southern and Western States, saw that the anti-slavery agitation would give them great additional strength. The abolitionists were, of course, in favor of a consolidated government, in order that they might, through it, assail slavery in the States, and it was natural that those at the North, who wished to use the government as a great money-making machine for themselves, should seek an alliance with them.

The Northern Whigs, however, had to play a part which was attended with great risk, and required the most delicate management. If they went too far, they might show their hand to the Southern Whigs, and thus by losing the whole South, and the moderate men of the North, incur defeat. It was their purpose, if possible, to beat their opponents, the democrats, without driving off from them the freesoilers and other anti-slavery men. They were willing to take up General Taylor if he would avoid publicly committing himself, on the subject of slavery, in the Territories. His friends induced him so to act as to meet their views. He declared, in substance, that he would not veto a bill unless it was, in his view, unconstitutional. With him as a candidate they could take the position that, as the restriction of slavery or Wilmot Proviso had already been settled by repeated precedents, he would not fail to sign such a bill; and hence it was only necessary for the people of the North to be sure to elect men pledged to the proviso and other kindred measures. They relied on the fact of Taylor being a large slaveholder and his military popularity, to satisfy the Southern Whigs. But if any other candidate, among those prominent, had been nominated, a declaration of principles might have been required.

It was because I saw that Taylor's candidacy, in the attitude in which he then stood before the country, would be used to strengthen the anti-slavery movement, that I attempted to have General Scott nominated rather than Taylor. Immediately after the nomination of the latter, I was surprised to discover that Mr. Seward's special friends, though they had been ostensibly against General Taylor, were really gratified by his nomination.

To show how the desire to beat the Democratic party restrained the action of the Northern Whigs, in their anti-slavery movements, I republish a letter written for the following reason: Mr. Erastus Brooks, of the *New York Express*, had a controversy with Mr. Charles Francis Adams, then according to my recollection, publishing a newspaper of strong anti-slavery views, as to what would have been the course of the late ex-President John Quincy Adams, in the contest then in progress. Mr. Brooks, to sustain his position, called on me for a statement. What follows was published in the *Express*:

THE LATE JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND GENERAL TAYLOR.

[CORRESPONDENCE OF THE NEW YORK EXPRESS.]

WASHINGTON, July 31, 1848.

The Hon. D. P. King and Charles Hudson, of Massachusetts, have both written letters in answer to certain inquiries propounded to them as to the views of John Quincy Adams touching General Taylor and the Presidency. In a previous letter I had occasion to speak of these opinions, but not until I saw an attempt to discredit what Mr. Adams had said. I send you now a further confirmatory letter from another member of Congress—one with whom Mr. Adams was in frequent communication, and who shared his confidence and friendship. The letter not only shows no hostility to General

Taylor, but an agreeable anticipation in his expected nomination and election. It shows, also, the far-reaching sagacity of the "old man eloquent" in predicting a result so soon to be ratified by the popular will:

Letter from Hon. T. L. Clingman, of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, July 31, 1848.

SIR: Your note has just been received, in which you state that you have learned from the Hon. Messrs. King and Hudson that I remembered a conversation with Mr. Adams on the subject of General Taylor's election as President, and express a desire that I would detail the substance of what he said as nearly as I can remember it.

The conversation to which I presume they referred occurred under the following circumstances: It so happened that Mr. Adams and myself were among the first members to arrive at this city, previous to the assembling of the present Congress. A few days before the commencement of the session he paid me a visit at my lodgings. As the day was cloudy and cold, while I assisted him in from his carriage, I could not forbear expressing my surprise at seeing him from home in such weather. He replied, that when the weather was bad, he always rode in his carriage; but that at other times he walked a good deal. His advanced age and apparent frailty made me deeply sensible that, by his visit, he was paying me a compliment that he would soon be unable to offer to any one.

He must have remained with me nearly an hour, and, notwithstanding his extreme debility, he expressed his views with a clearness and force that surprised me. It having been reported just previously that he had declared it his purpose to support the Administration in the conquest and acquisition of the whole of Mexico, I was the more desirous to hear his opinion on this and other topics connected with it; so, in the earlier parts of the conversation, I purposely avoided intimating any opinion which might in any manner tend to induce him to modify the expression of his views. I have no reason to doubt but that, in that conversation, frank and communicative as he was, he expressed his views fully and without reserve. Though it would be impossible for me to give from memory the whole of that conversation, yet I cannot be mistaken in relation to its general import and substance, while particular expressions are strongly impressed on my recollection.

Of the war and its authors he spoke in strong terms of condemnation. "They," he said, referring to the friends of the Administration, "expect me to speak on the war, but I am not a going to do it." This was said with peculiar emphasis. "If," he added, "I were to speak, I should have to discuss slavery, and that would do harm." He then went on to say that he was for *peace*, and that the proper way to obtain peace was to turn out of power the present Administration. He then spoke of the presidential election, and said that General Taylor would be the candidate of the Whigs. I suggested that some persons were waiting for a further expression of General Taylor's views. He instantly replied: "Oh, he is a Whig;" or "I have no doubt but that he is a Whig;" and, while speaking of the probable nomination, he said: "The South, I take it, will be for him, and part of the North," and he added that he had no doubt that he would be the nominee of the party. Though I do not recollect any particular expression of preference to General Taylor over the other Whigs spoken of as probable candidates, yet I cannot be mistaken in saying that he had a settled conviction that he would be the candidate of the party, and that he expressed a strong desire for its success.

In fact he seemed to be as strongly identified in his feelings and views with the Whig party, and as anxious for its triumph, as he used to be in 1844, when Mr. Clay was the candidate. I was even surprised to hear him express a determination to refrain from discussing the subject of slavery, in which he usually manifested so much interest, lest by speaking on it he should jeopard the success of the party. Subsequently, during the month of January, at his own house, he referred to the subject, and said: "I did not intend to speak upon it, but I owe you one for that speech the other day," alluding to my speech on the slave question. On my replying that I hoped he would leave that among his unpaid debts, he laughed and reiterated his determination not to speak upon the subject during the session.

In conclusion, allow me to say that I have not the slightest doubt but that, were he living at this day, he would be a cordial and earnest supporter of General Taylor's election.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

ERASTUS BROOKS, Esq.

This shows that Mr. Adams was so strong a party man that, during that session, the last in which he served, he forebore to speak on the great slavery issue, lest he might jeopardize the success of his party. From frequent conversations with him at previous sessions, I was satisfied that there was not on the floor of the House a member more thoroughly hostile to the Democratic party than he was.

It may not be out of place for me here to refer to a circumstance, which occurred during the Spring of 1848, that ought to be stated as an act of justice to Mr. Calhoun. In common with many others, up to that time, I had believed that Mr. Calhoun's course had been influenced by a desire to dissolve the Union, but what then occurred satisfied me that I had done him injustice. As a means of settling the slavery agitation, what was known as the Clayton Compromise, was brought forward. It was not only fiercely assailed by the Northern Whigs, who desired no settlement, and who vehemently declared to the Southern members of the party, that if the measure should pass, it would secure the election of General Cass, but as it fell short of doing the South full justice, many Southern Whigs were disinclined to support it.

During its pendency in the Senate, General Waddy Thompson, an intimate personal friend, called one morning to see me. He said he wished to consult me about a matter of importance, and remarked, "I am just from Calhoun, with whom I have had a full conversation. He says, if you and Toombs and Stephens and Preston (of Virginia) and Cabell will unite with him and his friends, in an address to the people of the South, asking them to join, without distinction of party, in holding a convention, to insist on a proper recognition of their rights, he will, this morning, in the Senate, take ground against the Clayton Compromise, and defeat it, for he is satisfied that it does not do justice to the South; but, unless you are willing to do this, he is convinced that nothing better can be done at this time, and says this measure will, for the present, at least, settle the agitation, and, for a time, give peace to the country, and that we must trust to the future." Though this attempt was not made, and Mr. Calhoun assisted in passing the measure through the Senate, yet the proposition from him satisfied me that Mr. Calhoun was really a friend of the Union on the principles of the Constitution. To a man, desirous of disunion, agitation of course was desirable. The fact that he was willing to assist in passing a measure that fell short of doing justice to his section, because it would put an end to the agitation, and for a time, at

least, give quiet to the country, was, to my mind, decisive that he did not desire a dissolution of the Union. I subsequently referred to this matter on the floor of the Senate.

In view of the much more objectionable and disastrous scheme, adopted in 1850, it is much to be deplored that the Clayton Compromise was defeated in the House by the aid of several Southern Whigs, who were misled by the pressure brought to bear on them by their Northern party associates, who affirmed that if the measure passed, it would elect Cass and destroy the Whig party in the North. They, too, declared in the strongest language again and again, that if the Southern Whigs would only aid them in defeating this scheme, which they pronounced a mere democratic trick to enable them to carry their candidate, they would, immediately after the election, aid us in passing a liberal and just measure. These promises were made repeatedly in my hearing, but I had seen by this time too much of their insincerity on this question to put any reliance on their assurances.

[The controversy in relation to the Mexican territory had been kept up throughout the years 1848 and 1849. The position of General Taylor in the canvass had enabled the Northern whigs to obtain a great preponderance in the election of members of Congress, aided as they had been most materially by the candidacy of Mr. Van Buren as the representative of the free soil party. This result had been produced in so quiet a manner that the people of the South of both parties had remained, to a great extent, in profound ignorance of the situation.

In the autumn of 1849 I was traveling in the interior of some of the Northern States, and for the first time realized the extent of the anti-slavery movement. On my return to Washington, I found my Senatorial colleague, Mr. Mangum, there. I stated to him that as far as I could ascertain the entire Whig delegation from the North were understood to be pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the application of the Wilmot proviso to all the Mexican territory. Also, that not only would the Buffalo platform or Van Buren Democrats act with them, but that the supporters of General Cass, disappointed as they had been, were disinclined to make a longer struggle, and were not unwilling that the Wilmot proviso, &c., should be passed and presented to General Taylor for his signature. Mr. Mangum seemed very much surprised on hearing my statement and said: "Foote," (meaning Senator Foote, of Mississippi,) "was here the other day and made a similar statement, but I supposed he must be excited without sufficient cause, and must have greatly exaggerated the condition of affairs at the North;" and suggested to me that I had better see Senator Foote.

On meeting him a few days later on the street, Mr. Foote said he was fully assured that the free soil Democrats and the Whigs of the North would, immediately after the assembling of Congress, pass the Wilmot proviso. That Cass' friends, some of them from vexation and others because they regarded further resistance to the anti-slavery current as hopeless, would make no serious struggle against the passage of the measure. He said that he felt satisfied that the Virginia Senators, Messrs. Mason and Hunter, would at once retire, and go to Richmond and report to the Legislature, which would then be in session, and that as Virginia as well as the other Southern States had declared that the exclusion of the South from all the Mexican acquisition

would present a case for resistance, such action would then be taken as to dissolve the Union within six weeks after the meeting of Congress. I replied that if proper pains were taken to inform the people of the South of the danger, there would be such a manifestation of feeling and purpose that it would produce a reaction in the North, which would lead to a just settlement of the question involved, and give a permanent peace to the Union.

Senator Foote in a day or two addressed a letter to me, to which I replied in the following words:

Reply of Mr. Clingman to Mr. Foote.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, November 13, 1849.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 10th instant has been received, in which you ask my own views, as well as my opinion, as to what will be the course of the South in either of the contingencies referred to. Your position as a Representative of one of the States, and the consideration due you personally merit alike a prompt reply.

Having on former occasions given my views in detail with reference to the whole subject, it is not necessary for me to do so at this time. I proceed, therefore, to give you simply the general results of my reflections.

The Federal Government, because it is the government of the United States, is the trustee and agent for *all* the States and their citizens. Every power, therefore, which it can rightfully exercise, it must of necessity exercise for the benefit of all the parties to it. The territory of the United States being the common property, the government is bound to administer it as far as practicable for the benefit of all the States as well as their citizens. A difference, however, exists among them in the institution of slavery. When the Constitution was formed twelve of the thirteen States were slaveholding. That instrument, though it has clauses expressly inserted for the protection of the rights and interest of slaveholders, contains no provision for the abolition of slavery anywhere. If the government, therefore, can properly exercise such a power in any instance, it must be because its duties as a general agent, acting so as to meet the interest and views of its principals, require it. But fifteen of the thirty States of the Union still maintain the institution of slavery. It is obvious, therefore, that the government could not, consistently with its powers as a general agent exclude the slaveholders as a class from all participation in the enjoyment of the territory of the United States. It is, on the contrary, under solemn obligations to respect the rights of all. It has always heretofore, as I understand its action, shown a sense of this obligation. When the much talked of ordinance was adopted, by which the territory north of the Ohio river was made free, all that portion of country south of the river to the Gulf of Mexico was left to be occupied by slaveholders. When slavery was abolished in the northern part of the Louisiana territory, the southern portion, regarded as the most suitable for slaveholders, was left to be so occupied. On the annexation of Texas, when a provision against slavery north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, was incorporated, much the larger and more valuable portion was left still for the use of slaveholders.

But it is now proposed to adopt the policy of excluding slaveholders, as such, from all the territory of the United States. This would be an entire revolution in the action of the government—a revolution which could not occur without a total violation of the spirit and essence of the Constitution. Since those citizens who do not own slaves are permitted to occupy every part of the territory of the Union, it has been doubted by many whether the government can rightfully exclude slaveholders from any portion of the

common property. But even if there should be a power to divide the public territory for convenience between the two classes, it is perfectly clear that there can be no right to exclude one class entirely. I have heretofore said that I should regard such an exclusion as being as great a violation of the Constitution as the government could possibly commit. But even if this action should be viewed simply as an enormous abuse of power, it would be not the less objectionable. The government has unlimited powers in relation to the establishment of post-offices throughout the Union. If, however, it were to withdraw all the post-offices from the slaveholding States on the ground that the citizens of those States were not worthy of the countenance and aid of the government, we should have as much reason to complain of such action as if it involved a clear infraction of the letter of the Constitution.

In a word, if the government should adopt the policy of excluding slaveholders, as such, from all the territory of the United States, it would, in substance and effect, cease to be the government of the United States. While the form of the constitution might remain the same, its character would be essentially changed.

Ought the Southern States to acquiesce in this great organic change in our political system? Ought they to remain members of an association which had, in utter disregard of plain constitutional guarantees, degraded them from their position of equality? As history furnishes no record of any people who have prospered after they had forfeited their self-respect, by submitting to be degraded to a state of political vassalage, I hold it to be the duty of the Southern States to resist this change. That resistance, to be effectual, should be commensurate with the violence of the attack. This they owe to the cause of constitutional liberty, to justice, and their own honor.

With reference to the abolition of slavery, in the District of Columbia, I will simply say that, waiving all controversy in relation to constitutional right, and obligation to the adjoining States, if such an event were to occur at this time, it would not take place in obedience to the wishes of the citizens of the District, but would be brought about at the instance of the inhabitants of the States. But these persons have no right to control the local affairs of this District. Should Congress, therefore, thus act at their instigation, it would be guilty of an act of tyranny so insulting and so gross as to justify a withdrawal of confidence from such a government.

You ask, in the second place, what I believe likely to be the course of the South should such a contingency occur? There was but one of the States having any considerable number of slaves in relation to which I had any doubts. From her frontier position, and the powerful influences brought to bear on her, I had some fears as to what might be the action of Kentucky. But I have been gratified, beyond expression, by the gallant stand which that noble State has recently taken. She has thereby shown that she will not abandon her sisters in the hour of danger, but that she will, if necessary, take the front rank in the struggle for the preservation of the rights and liberties of the white race of the South. The union of both parties in Mississippi is a type of what will occur elsewhere. The Southern States ought to have but one feeling on this question, as they can have but one destiny. I have no doubt but that over the entire South there would be a vastly greater unanimity than existed in the old thirteen slave States, when they decided to resist British aggression. If a few individuals should attempt to take a different course, they would be swept away in the general current. Long before the struggle should come to the worst, the South would present an unbroken front.

I am not unaware, sir, that in making so brief and concise a statement of my views I incur the risk of misconception and misrepresentation, but I should feel that I did not appreciate the momentous nature of the subject if I could attach consequence to mere personal considerations.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

Hon. H. S. FOOTE.

P. S.—Since the above letter was written, it has been submitted to my colleague, Mr. Mangum, and he concurs fully in all its general conclusions, and avows his purpose to make known his views at length at an early day, and entertains the opinion that the Federal Government has no power to legislate on the subject of slavery either in the States or Territories, and that all the precedents, whether legislative or judicial, because adopted without due consideration, are not obligatory. T. L. C.

These letters were, at my request, but with much reluctance on the part of Mr. Gales, published in the *National Intelligencer*. I say reluctance, not because Mr. Gales was at all desirous of seeing the Union dissolved, or even a serious collision. It is true that he had strong English feelings against slavery, but party considerations were probably even more potent than these prejudices. This paper had the full confidence of the Southern Whigs, and its utterances were accepted by most of their papers in the South. The *Intelligencer* constantly represented the Northern people as most conservative in their views, and insisted that the abolitionists were but a handful of agitators, &c. The people of the South were thus left in the most profound ignorance of the danger that was impending. The few Southern men who went North remained in the large cities, came in contact with no anti-slavery men, and were assured by such gentlemen as they met of their personal and political friendship, &c.

In my conversation with Mr. Gales, I urged him to change his course, unless he wished the people of both sections to be placed in the position of a body of troops suddenly exposed to heavy masked batteries. It was in vain that I pressed him to take a different view and by warning the country of the danger, avert it. He reminded me of a horse frightened by a stump at a distance, and while keeping his attention fixed on it, and shying off, falling into a ditch on the opposite side. My earnest efforts made no impression on him, and but for his strong personal friendship for me, I doubt if I could have induced him to publish the letters.

The fact that Mr. Foote and I had previously represented the extremes of the two parties, and that the correspondence was brief, caused the letters to be generally republished over the country. With the exception of a few persons, the people of most of the Southern States were profoundly ignorant of approaching peril. Their condition might be likened to that of the crew of a ship floating lazily in a gentle breeze with all sails set, in the presence of an approaching tropical white squall. Surprise was created, with some anxiety, and there began to be popular manifestations of a determination to resist these measures.

As the session approached nearer, there were developed additional reasons for anxiety. An evening or two before its commencement, on meeting Mr. Foote he said to me, "I fear you will have to give up your hope of saving the Union, for the case seems more and more threatening." On my expressing dissenting opinion, he added, "Well, you have high authority on your side,

for I have just received a letter from Mr. Calhoun in which he says that the stand the South is now beginning to take will save the Union."

As soon as Mr. Toombs and Mr. Stephens arrived I sought an early interview with them. The position they might take was especially important because they had been original, independent Taylor men, and ought, therefore, to be able to exercise much influence over the administration. Meeting them together one morning I gave them a statement of the condition of political matters in the North. They seemed surprised as to the extent of the danger. When I saw them on the next day, Mr. Toombs said, "If you are right in your impressions, and I have no doubt but that you are, we had better make the issue at once on the election of speaker." I replied that I did not regard this as wise, because the issue was too small an one; that we could not make our views known and our purpose might be misunderstood.

When the Whig caucus met, Mr. Toombs, in pursuance of his policy, offered a resolution, in substance, declaring that the Congress ought not to take action on the slavery issues. During the discussion of it, Mr. Brooks, of New York, said that he, and his colleague, Mr. Briggs, had had a conference and agreed that they would not at that, the first session of Congress, vote to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. He would, however, make no pledge as to his course at the second session, nor agree to vote against the Wilmot proviso. No other member from the North said even this much, but as far as they spoke, during the evening, they all admitted that either by the resolutions in the convention in which they had been nominated, or by their own declarations, they had been pledged to put the Wilmot proviso on all the Territories, and also to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and wherever the government had jurisdiction.

It must be remembered that three-fourths of those elected as Whigs to the Congress came from the North, for though only eighty-four of them attended our caucuses, yet there were about a half-dozen, formerly Whigs, elected partly, as free-soilers also, and who on all the slavery issues were even in advance of the other Whigs. It was their refusal to vote for Mr. Winthrop that defeated him. Substantially, the party in the House of Representatives stood ninety anti-slavery members from the North, and thirty members from the South.

There was a long contest for the speakership, which terminated in the election of the Hon. Howell Cobb, by a plurality vote, over the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop. Immediately after the organization of the House, the speech of the twenty-second of January, 1850, was made. The object being to arrest the attention of the people of the country, and cause them to realize the impending danger, I sought to present the case as strongly as possible. Such was the imminence of peril, that I saw that there was but one mode of arresting it, and that was by the most earnest appeals, and as strong a statement as the truth would warrant.]

SPEECH

IN DEFENCE OF THE SOUTH AGAINST THE AGGRESSIVE
MOVEMENT OF THE NORTH, DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 22, 1850.

The House being in Committee of the Whole, on the state of the Union, Mr. Boyd, of Kentucky, in the chair:

Mr. CLINGMAN said, that the committee was well aware that he had, on yesterday, intimated a purpose to discuss the questions involved in the propositions relating to the Mexican territory. That subject was regarded by the whole country as one of such immense importance that he offered no apology for debating it. To prevent misconception, (said he) I say in advance, that I have great confidence in the judgment, integrity and patriotism of the President. I further admit fully the right of the citizens of each State to settle for themselves all such domestic questions as that referred to in the message. But who are the people entitled so to decide, as well as the time and manner of admission and boundary of new States, are in themselves questions for the judgment of Congress under all the circumstances of each case. The territory of Louisiana, our first foreign acquisition, was retained nearly ten years in that condition before it was allowed to form a State Constitution. In the case of Texas—her people being composed almost entirely of citizens of the United States, and having had a State government of their own for ten years—she was admitted at once as a State into the Union. In the present case, there are considerations of the greatest importance connected directly and indirectly with our action on this subject. While adverting to them, as fully as the time limited by our rules will admit, I ask the attention of the House.

With reference to this matter, I was placed at a disadvantage before the country by a publication made some time since. It is generally known that there was, on the Saturday evening before the time for the assembling of the House, a preliminary meeting or caucus of the Whig members. The proceedings of such meetings have usually been kept private. Contrary, however, to the former usage in this respect, some individual present furnished to one of the New York papers what purported to be a report of the proceedings. This report being in some respects authentic, was copied into other papers. The writer gave very fully the speeches of those persons whose views coincided with his own; but, though he made a reference to my position, he did not think proper to set out what I did say, so as to make that position at all understood. It will be remembered by those present on that occasion, that, at the very outset of my remarks, I stated that I had that morning had a very full and free conference with the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Toombs,) who had moved the resolution; that there was,

in relation to the whole subject embraced in it, as well as with reference to the mode of action proper to be adopted by the South, an entire agreement between that gentleman and myself. In fact, that there was not, as far as I knew, any difference of opinion between us, except as to the expediency of making the issue at that time, and that I thought it preferable to await legislative action and stand on the defensive purely. This, among other reasons then given, induced me to request the withdrawal of the resolution. It is proper that I should say that, in my interview that morning with the gentleman from Georgia, and with his colleague, (Mr. Stephens,) I gave my reasons at length, founded chiefly on my recent observation of the state of public sentiment in the North, for believing that a collision was inevitable, and that the sooner it came on the better for all parties; but that to enable us to make our demonstration in the most imposing and successful mode, it would be better to await the organization of the House. I expressed the fear that if we moved without the concurrence at the outset of a majority of the Southern members, we might place ourselves at a disadvantage before the public, and prevent our uniting the whole South in such a course of action as it might be found expedient to adopt.

Looking over the whole ground, however, I am not at all dissatisfied with the course which things took. There has been no such division at the South as would be at all likely to impair efficient action hereafter. From the tone of the Southern press, as well as from other indications, it is obvious that the South will, at an early day, be sufficiently united to insure the success of whatever measures it may be necessary to adopt to protect ourselves from the aggression menaced by the North. As to the election of a Speaker, in the present condition of the House and the country, I have never considered it of the slightest moment to either political party, or to either section of the Union. A Speaker without a majority of the House would be of no advantage to the administration, nor could any mere arrangement of committees materially affect now the action on the slave question.

Those, Mr. Chairman, who have observed my course heretofore, know well that I have not sought to produce agitation on this subject. Six years ago, when I first took a seat on this floor, believing that the famous twenty-first rule had been gotten up merely as a fancy matter, which was productive only of ill feeling and irritation between different sections, I both voted and spoke against it, and was then regarded as responsible to a great extent for its defeat. I then stated, during the discussion, that if without cause we kept up a state of hostility between the North and the South, until a practical question arose like that presented when Missouri was admitted, (for I then saw the Texas annexation in the future,) the "greatest possible mischief might ensue." I went on also, in the course of my argument, to say that slavery could not be abolished in this district without a dissolution of the Union. Two years since, when it had become certain that we were at the close of the then existing war to obtain territory, I endeavored to place the question on grounds where the North might meet us; conceding, for the sake of argument, that the government had complete jurisdiction over the territory. I endeavored to show, that while it might be jus-

tified in *dividing the territory*, it could not exclude us from the whole without a palpable violation of the Constitution. I am sorry to say, however, that my effort, though well meant, did not produce the slightest effect upon the *action* of any one gentleman of my own party from the North. On this side of the House, they regularly voted that the North should have the whole of the territory, and went against any compromise. I regret to be compelled to say that instead of showing themselves in any respect conservative, as I used to consider them, the Northern Whig members proved themselves, on this, the great question, eminently destructive.

To those gentlemen from the North, who aided us in an attempt to settle the question in some manner not disgraceful or destructive to us, I tender my thanks. In standing by the rights of the South, they have shown themselves friends of the Constitution and of the Union.

Sir, the force and extent of the present anti-slavery movement of the North is not understood by the South. Until within the last few months, I had supposed that even if California and New Mexico should come in as free States, the agitation would subside so as to produce no further action. A few months' travel in the interior of the North has changed my opinion. Such is now the condition of public sentiment there, that the making of the Mexican territory all free, in any mode, would be regarded as an anti-slavery triumph, and would accelerate the general movement against us. It is not difficult to perceive how that state of public sentiment has been produced there. The old abolition societies have done a good deal to poison the popular mind. By circulating an immense number of inflammatory pamphlets, filled with all manner of falsehood and calumny against the South, its institutions, and its men, because there was no contradiction in that quarter, they had created a high degree of prejudice against us. As soon as it became probable that there would be an acquisition of territory, the question at once became a great practical one, and the politicians immediately took the matter in hand. With a view at once of strengthening their position, they seized upon all this matter which the abolition societies (whose aid both parties courted in the struggle) had furnished from time to time, and diffused and strengthened it as much as possible, and thereby created an immense amount of hostility to Southern institutions. Everything there contributes to this movement; candidates are brought out by the caucus system, and if they fail to take that sectional ground which is deemed strongest there, they are at once discarded. The mode of nominating candidates, as well as of conducting the canvass, is destructive of anything like independence in the representative. They do not, as gentlemen often do in the South and West, take ground against the popular clamor, and sustain themselves by direct appeals to the intelligence and reason of their constituents. Almost the whole of the Northern press co-operated in the movement, with the exception of the *New York Herald* (which with its large circulation, published matter on both sides,) and a few other liberal papers, everything favorable to the South has been carefully excluded from the Northern papers. By these combined efforts,

a degree of feeling and prejudice has been gotten up against the South, which is most intense in all the interior.

I was surprised last winter to hear a Northern Senator say, that in the town in which he lived, it would excite great astonishment if it were known that a Northern lady would, at the time of the meeting of the two Houses, walk up to the capitol with a Southern Senator; that they had been taught to consider Southerners generally as being so coarse and ruffianly in manner that a lady would not trust herself in such a presence. This anecdote, sir, does not present too strong a picture of the condition of sentiment in portions of the interior of the Northern country. How far gentlemen on this floor are to be influenced in their action by such a state of opinion, I leave them to decide.

The great principle upon which the Northern movement rests, which is already adopted by most Northern politicians, and to which they all seem likely to be driven by the force of the popular current there, if the question is unsettled till the next Congressional election, is this: That the Government of the United States must do nothing to sanction slavery; that it must therefore exclude it from the territories; that it must abolish it in the District of Columbia, forts, and arsenals, and wherever it has jurisdiction. Some, too, carrying the principle to its extent, insist that the coasting slave trade, and that between the States, should also be abolished, and that slave labor should not be tolerated in a public office of the United States, such as custom-houses, post-offices, and the like. As these things all obviously rest on the same general dogma, it is clear that the yielding of one or more points would not check, but would merely accelerate, the general movement to the end of the series. Before this end was reached, they would probably append, as a corollary the principle that the President should not appoint a slave-holder to office. It is, sir, my deliberate judgment that, in the present temper of the public mind at the North, if the territorial question remains open till the next election, few if any gentlemen will get here from the free States that are not pledged to the full extent of the abolition platform. It is, therefore, obviously the interest of all of us to settle this question at the present session.

That the general principle, above stated, is at war with the whole spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which sanctions slavery in several of its provisions, I need not argue here. Taking, however, a practical view of the matter in controversy, look for a moment at the territorial question, the great issue in the struggle. I will do Northern gentlemen on this floor the justice to admit that they have argued themselves into the belief that they are right in claiming the whole of the territory for free soil. Let me state, for a moment, the converse, or opposite of their proposition. Suppose it were to be claimed that no one should be allowed to go into this public territory, unless he carried one or more slaves with him, it might then be said, just as gentlemen now tell us, that it would be perfectly fair, because it placed every man who might be inclined to go there on an equal footing, and might, by means of making thus a homogeneous population, advance the general interest. Northern men would at once,

I suppose, object to this arrangement. Then we should say to them, if you do not like this restriction, let it be settled, then, that every citizen of the United States may go into the common territory, and carry slaves or not, just as he pleases. This would seem to be a perfectly equitable and fair arrangement. Northern men, however, object to this, and say that they are not willing to live in a territory where others own slaves. Then we, of the South, say to them, that we will consent to divide the territory, and limit our possession with slaves to a part of it, and allow them to go at will over the whole. Even to this they object, and insist that they will not allow us to occupy one foot of the territory. Remember, sir, that this very territory was acquired by conquest, and that while the South, according to its population, would have been required to furnish only one-third of the troops, it in point of fact did furnish two-thirds of the men that made the conquest. And the North, deficient as it was comparatively in the struggle, now says that its conscience, or its cupidity, will not permit us to have the smallest portion of that territory. Why, sir, this is the most *impudent* proposition that was ever maintained by any respectable body of men.

Sir, I give the North full credit for its feelings in favor of liberty. I can well suppose that Northern gentlemen would resist, in the most emphatic manner, the attempt to make any man who is now free a slave; but I regard them as too intelligent to believe that humanity, either to the slave or the master, requires that they should be pent up within a territory which, after a time, will be insufficient for their subsistence, and where they must perish from want, or from the collisions that would occur between the races. Nor can I suppose that they think it would be injurious to New Mexico and California for our people to go and settle among them. Prominent Northern statesmen, both in this House and in the Senate, have described the population of those Territories, and have represented it as being not only inferior to those Indian tribes that we know most of, viz: the Cherokees and Choctaws, but as being far below the Flat Heads, Black Feet, and Snake Indians. I cannot, therefore, suppose that they really believe that those Territories would be injured by having infused into them such a state of society as produces such persons as George Washington, John Marshall, and thousands of other great and virtuous men, living and dead. Your opposition to our right will be regarded as resting on the lust for political power of your politicians, or on the rapacity of your people.

The idea that the conquered people should be permitted to give law to the conquerors, is so preposterously absurd, that I do not intend to argue it. Doubtless these people would be willing, not only to exclude slaveholders, but all other Americans, if, by a simple vote they were allowed to do so. I may remark further, that, but for the anti-slavery agitation, our Southern slaveholders would have carried their negroes into the mines of California in such numbers, that I have no doubt but that the majority there would have made it a slaveholding State. We have been deprived of all chance of this by the Northern movements, and by the action of this House, which has, by Northern votes, repeatedly, from time to time, passed the Wilmot proviso, so as in effect

to exclude our institutions, without the actual passage of a law for that purpose. It is a mere farce, therefore, without giving our people time to go into the country, if they desire to do so, to allow the individuals there by a vote, to exclude a whole class of our citizens. This would imply that the territory belonged to the people there exclusively, and not to all the people of the United States.

Compared with this great question, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia is of little relative moment. One effect, however, of the anti-slavery agitation here is worthy of a passing notice. Within the last two years, since the matter has become serious, it has seemed not improbable that the seat of government might be removed from the District. As this would be extremely prejudicial to the interests of the citizens here, many of them have so far changed in their feelings as to be willing to allow slavery to be abolished, yielding to the force of the pressure from the North; besides so many of their slaves are from time to time taken away by the Abolitionists, as to satisfy them that such property here is almost worthless. A great impression was made on them by the coming in last year of a Northern ship, and its carrying away seventy slaves at once. Seeing that there was no chance of getting Congress to pass any adequate law for their protection as most of the States have done, they seem to be forced to assent to some extent to the Northern movement. Sir, it is most surprising that the people of the Southern States should have borne with so little complaint, the loss of their slaves incurred by the action of the free States. The Constitution of the United States provided for the delivery of all such fugitives, and Congress passed an act to carry it into effect; but recently, most, if not all of the Northern States, have completely defeated their provisions, by forbidding any one of their citizens to aid in the execution of the law, under the penalty of fine and imprisonment for as long a term usually as five years. There is probably no one legal mind in any one of the free States which can regard these laws as constitutional. For though the States are not bound to legislate affirmatively in support of the Constitution of the United States, yet it is clear that they have no right to pass laws to obstruct the execution of constitutional provisions. Private citizens are not usually bound to be active in execution of the law; but if two or more combine to prevent the execution of any law, they are subject to indictment for conspiracy in all countries where the common law doctrines prevail. If the several States could rightfully legislate to defeat the action of Congress, they might thereby completely nullify most of its laws. In this particular instance such has been the result; for, though the master is allowed to go and get his negro if he can, yet, in point of fact, it is well known that the free negroes, Abolitionists, and other disorderly persons, acting under the countenance and authority of the State laws, are able usually to overpower the master and prevent his recapture.

The extent of the loss to the South may be understood from the fact, that the number of runaway slaves now in the North is stated as being thirty thousand; worth, at present prices, little short of fifteen millions of dollars. Suppose that amount of property was taken away

from the North by the Southern States acting against the Constitution ; what complaint would there not be ; what memorials, remonstrances, and legislative resolutions would come down upon us ? How would this hall be filled with lobby members, coming here to press their claims upon Congress ? Why, sir, many of the border counties in the slaveholding States have been obliged to give up their slaves almost entirely. It was stated in the newspapers the other day, that a few counties named, in Maryland, had, by the efforts of the Abolitionists within six months, upon computation, lost one hundred thousand dollars worth of slaves. A gentleman of the highest standing, from Delaware, assured me the other day that that little State lost, each year, at least that value of such property in the same way. A hundred thousand dollars is a heavy tax to be levied on a single congressional district by the Abolitionists.

Suppose a proportional burden was inflicted on the Northern States. How would Massachusetts bear the loss annually of one million one hundred thousand dollars, not only inflicted without law, but against an express provision of the Constitution ? We may infer from the complaint she has made of a slight inconvenience imposed on her by that regulation of South Carolina which prevented ship-captains from carrying free negro servants to Charleston.

This whole action on the part of the North is not only in violation of the Constitution, but seems to be purely wanton, or originating in malice towards the South. It is obvious that they do not want our slaves among them ; because they not only make no adequate provision for their comfort, but, in fact, in many of the States, have forbidden free negroes to come among them on pain of imprisonment, &c. It cannot be a desire to liberate slaves, because they have never to my knowledge, attempted to steal negroes from Cuba or Brazil. It is true, however, that having the right now to come among us both by land and water, they have greater advantages and immunities. For if they went into a foreign country, they would incur the risk of being shot or hanged, as robbers and pirates usually are.

Sir, if any evils have grown out of the existence of slavery, they have not at least affected the North. During the days of the slave trade, which (as I formerly had occasion to remark) was continued down to 1808 by New England votes in the Convention, the Northern ship-owners realized large profits by purchasing negroes on the coast of Africa at thirty or forty dollars per head, and selling them to Southern planters for several hundred dollars. The bringing in of these slaves caused large tracts of the Southern country, too unhealthy to have been cleared by white men, to be brought under profitable cultivation. The price of cotton has thereby been brought down from fifty to ten and even five cents per pound. An immense amount of capital and labor is employed profitably in its manufacture at the North. In England, also, not less than six hundred millions of dollars is thus invested, and a vast population exists by being employed in the manufacture. It is ascertained that at least five millions of white persons, in Europe and this country, get their employment, are fed, and exist on the manufacture of cotton alone. The cheap Southern pro-

duction of the raw material not only is the means of thus giving subsistence to a great portion of the population of this country and Europe, but is clothing the world at a cheap rate. In addition to cotton, rice, sugar, coffee, tobacco, and various tropical productions, are supplied at a cheap rate for Northern consumption. On the other hand, our slaves seldom come in competition with Northern labor, and are good consumers of its productions. While the North has derived these great advantages, the negroes themselves have not been sufferers. Their condition not only compares most advantageously with that of the laboring population of the world, but is in advance of the position they have been able, at any time, to occupy at home. The researches of Gliddon and other antiquarians, show that four thousand years ago in Africa they were slaves, and as black as they now are. Since then, in that country where they were placed by Providence, and where, from their peculiar constitution, they enjoy the best health, they have existed only as savages. They are there continually made slaves by the men of more intelligent and enterprising races. Nor have they ever gotten out of the tropical parts of Africa, except when they were carried as merchandise. It remains to be proved, however, yet to the world, that the negro, any more than the horse, can permanently exist, in a state of freedom, out of the tropical regions. Their decay at the North, as well as other circumstances which I have not time to detail, are adverse to the proposition. And yet, sir, the journals of the North, while they deny that the French and the Germans, the most enlightened of the continental nations of Europe, are capable of freedom, stoutly maintain that the negro is; the negro, who has never anywhere, when left to himself, gotten up to the respectable state of barbarism which all the other races have attained, not even excepting our Indians in Mexico and Peru.

While the people of the Northern States and the negroes have been benefitted, I am not prepared to admit that the South (if injured at all) has suffered as generally supposed. The influx of foreign emigrants, and some other circumstances to which I will presently advert, have in some respects put the North greatly ahead. But if you deduct the foreign population which goes chiefly to the North—the little we get not being equal to that portion of our own people who go to the Northwestern States; if you deduct this, I say, it will be found that the white population of all the slaveholding States has increased faster than that of the free States. Owing to the comfortable condition of our population, if there had been no emigration from abroad, the descendants of our portion of the American white family would be more numerous than the Northern. Nor is it true that we are the poorer; on the contrary, if we are to take the valuations of property in the different States, as assessed by the public officers, it appears that the slaveholding States are much richer in proportion to their population than the free. Even if you exclude the negroes as property, and count them in the population, it appears that the citizens of Virginia—the oldest of the slave States—are richer per head than the citizens of any one of the free States. It will also appear that the slaveholding States have vastly

less pauperism and crime than the Northern States. Looking, therefore, at all these different elements, viz: greater increase of population, more wealth, and less poverty and crime, we have reason to regard our people as prosperous and happy.

Sir, I have not, for want of time, gone into details on these points, but contented myself with the statement of those general views which every candid inquirer will, I am satisfied, find to be true. I do not seek to make comparisons that might be regarded as invidious, unless by way of defence against habitual attacks on us; but I regard it as right to say on this occasion, that whether considered with reference to the physical comfort of the people, or a high state of public and private morals, elevated sense of honor, and of all generous emotions, I have no reason to believe that a higher state of civilization either now exists elsewhere, or has existed at any time in the past, than is presented by the Southern States of the Union.

When we look to foreign countries, these views are confirmed and sustained. Brazil, with a population of two slaves to one freeman, is the most prosperous of the South American States, and the only one which has a stable political system. Cuba is greatly in advance of the other West India islands, though St. Domingo and Jamaica once equalled her before the emancipation of their slaves. Besides the expense of maintaining her government at home, Cuba pays Spain a revenue of nearly fourteen millions. This is a greater sum for her population than two hundred millions would be for the United States. Could our people in addition to the expense of our State governments, pay six times as much as the Federal government has ever yet raised by impost and taxes? That Cuba should be able to bear this burden and still prosper, is evidence of the high productiveness of the system.

In spite, however, of these great facts, which ought to strike all impartial minds, the course of the North has been constantly aggressive on this question. The ordinance of 1787, adopted contemporaneously with the Constitution, made the territory north of the Ohio free, and left that south of the river slaveholding, giving the North more than half of all the existing territory. When Louisiana was acquired, slavery could legally exist in every part of it. The State of Missouri having formed a republican constitution, proposed to come into the Union, but the North resisted her application. Though her constitution recognising slavery was precisely like those of a majority of the old States, yet they, against all constitutional principle, because they had the power in one branch of Congress, obstinately refused her admission, until it was provided by act of Congress that no other slave State should exist north of 36 degrees 30 minutes. By that means, after leaving the South only territory for a single State, (Arkansas,) they acquired enough in extent to make ten or fifteen large States. Now, encouraged by their former success, and having become relatively stronger, they claim the whole of the territory.

Should we give way, what is to be the result? California, Oregon, New Mexico, Deseret, and Minnesota, will come into the Union in less than five years, giving the North a clear majority of ten or fifteen

votes in the Senate. The census of the coming year will, under the new apportionment, give them nearly two to one in this House. With immense controlling majorities in both branches, will they not at once, by act of Congress, abolish slavery in the States? Mr. Adams, who, in his day, controlled Northern opinion on this question, said that there were twenty provisions of the Constitution which, under certain circumstances, would give Congress the power. Would not this majority find the power, as easily as they have done in their State Legislatures, where they have complete sway, to nullify the provision of the Constitution for the protection of fugitive slaves? Have not prominent Northern politicians of the highest positions and the greatest influence, whose names are well known to all gentlemen on this floor, already declared that there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which obstructs or ought to obstruct the abolition of slavery by Congress in the States? Supposing, however, this should not occur, in twenty years or less, without new acquisitions of territory, they would get the power, by the coming in of new free States, to amend the Constitution for that purpose. But I have no doubt, sir, that other acquisitions of territory will be made. Probably, after the next presidential election we shall get that part of Mexico which lies along the gulf, as far as Vera Cruz; and from which, though well suited to the profitable employment of slave labor, we should be excluded, nevertheless, by the adoption of the principle that slavery should not be extended in area. Conceding, however, that I am wrong in both these suppositions, and that Congress would neither violate the Constitution nor amend it thus, what are we to expect? Slavery is to be kept, they say, where it now is; and we are to be surrounded with free States. These States not only prohibit the introduction of slaves, but also of free negroes, into their borders. Of course the whole negro population is to be hereafter confined to the territory of the present fifteen slave States. That population in twenty-five years will amount to seven or eight millions, and in fifty years to fifteen millions. However dense the population might become, the negroes will not be gotten away, but the wealthier portion of the white population (I mean such as were able to emigrate) would leave the territory. The condition of the South would, for a time, be that of Ireland; and soon, by the destruction of the remnants of the white population, become that of St. Domingo. There are those now living who would probably see this state of things; but it would be certain to overtake our children or grandchildren. These facts are staring us in the face as distinctly as the sun in the heavens at noonday. Northern men not only admit it, but, constantly, in their public speeches, avow it to be their purpose to produce this very state of things. If we express alarm at the prospect, they seek to amuse us with eulogies on the blessings of the Federal Union, and ask us to be still for a time. They do well, for it is true that communities have usually been destroyed by movements which, in the beginning, inflicted no immediate injury, and which were therefore acquiesced in till they had progressed too far to be resisted. They have, too, constant examples in the conduct of brute

animals, that do not struggle against evils until they begin to feel pain. They are doubtless, also, encouraged to hope for our submission on account of our acquiescence under their former wrongs. They know that the evils already inflicted on us, to which I have referred, greatly exceed in amount any injury that Great Britain attempted when she drove the colonies into resistance. Besides, sir, their aggressions have infinitely less show of constitutional right or color of natural justice. But what they now propose is too palpable even for Southern generosity. If after having been free for seventy years, the Southern States were to consent to be thus degraded and enslaved, instead of the pity, they would meet the scorn and contempt of the universe. The *men* of this generation, who would be responsible, ought to be whipped through their fields by their own negroes. I thank God that there is no one in my district that I think so meanly of, as to believe that he would not readily come into whatever movement might be necessary for the protection of our rights and liberty. I tell Northern gentlemen who are in hopes that the South will be divided, that we shall not have half as many traitors to hang as we did Tories in the Revolution.

If gentlemen mean that the Union, upon the principles of the Constitution, is desirable, I will not controvert that opinion. But the Union never could have been formed without the written Constitution. So, if you now, by your action, practically destroy the Constitution, those injured, if able to resist, will not submit. That instrument was ordained, in its own language, to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty" to all parties to it—namely, the freemen of the Union. If, therefore, under its form, gross *injustice* is done, insurrections excited, and the citizens of part of the States politically enslaved, then the Union ought not to stand, as an instrument of wrong and oppression.

There is throughout the South a strong attachment to the Union of the States. This sentiment rests not so much upon any calculations of interest as on historic associations and the recollection of common ancestral struggles and triumph. Our people take a pride in the name of the United States, and in being members of a great republic that furnishes a cheering example to the friends of liberty throughout the world. But the events of the last few years are rapidly weakening this feeling. Seeing that there appeared to be a settled purpose in the North to put them to the wall, many of our people, regarding a dissolution of the Union as the inevitable result of this aggression, have looked forward to the consequences of such a state of things.

I will tell Northern gentlemen, in the hope that many of them are not yet past the point of reason, what is the view presented in prospect to many of the highest intellects in the South. It is well known that the existing revenue system operates hardly on the South and the West. The government raises upwards of thirty millions annually by a duty or tax upon imports. But this system acts very unequally on the different sections of the country. For illustration of the mode of operation, I will take a single article. Railroad iron is produced in England at so cheap a rate, that it can be brought to this country

and sold, we may say, for \$40 per ton.* This is much cheaper than our people can afford to make it at. They therefore ask the government to require the payment of \$20 per ton by way of duty. The importer, therefore, instead of selling for \$40 per ton, must ask \$60, to reimburse himself for what he has paid out abroad, and to the government. Every person, therefore, in the United States, who purchases railroad iron, has to pay \$20 more for each ton. There are, however, some advantages to counterbalance this loss. In the first place, some of our people, finding that they can make a profit by selling railroad iron at \$60 per ton, engage in the manufacture, and thus find employment. While so engaged, these persons consume the produce of the farmers and others, and thus make a home market for agricultural productions. We see, however, that the loss of \$20 per ton falls on all those in any part of the United States who may consume the iron. But the benefit is confined to those persons who are engaged in making iron, and those who live so near them that they can conveniently get their produce to the factories. In fact, this sort of manufacturing is confined to the State of Pennsylvania, and perhaps a few other localities. But my constituents can no more pay the manufacturers of Pennsylvania for iron in the production of their farms, than they could the British iron-masters. It is therefore to our advantage, as we must pay for it in cash, to get the iron at the lowest rate. This is true of the Southern and Western people generally. This illustrates the effect of our revenue and protective system. The burden is diffused over the whole country, but the benefit is limited to the manufacturers and to those persons who reside so near as to have thereby a better market; very little more than one-third of the Union gets the benefit of the system, in exclusion mainly of the South and West.

It is not easy to measure the precise extent of this burden. It has been estimated that two-thirds of all the articles which would, if imported, be subject to pay a duty, are produced in the United States. To return, for ready illustration, to the case of railroad iron. If two of every three tons of iron consumed in the United State were made in this country, it would follow that the person who consumed those three tons of iron, while he paid twenty dollars to the government on the ton imported, would pay forty dollars to the home manufacturer; and if he lived so far from the manufacturer that he could not pay him in produce, it would follow that, in fact, while he paid the government but twenty dollars, he would lose sixty himself on account of the duty. When, therefore, the government gets, as it is doing, thirty-three millions of dollars revenue, the whole burden to the consumers of this country would be one hundred millions of dollars; of this amount the South pays, according to its population and consumption, forty millions of dollars. This sum I think too low in fact. In the Patent

* It is stated in the proceedings of the convention of iron workers recently held in Albany, New York, that some of the English establishments deliver bar iron on tide water at a cost ranging from \$17 to \$20 per ton, or less than one cent per pound; Scotch pig iron, they also say, can be delivered in New York, duties off, at a cost not exceeding \$14 to \$16 per ton.

Office report, made to the last session of Congress, (the last one published,) it is stated by the Commissioner, Mr. Burke, a Northern man, that the annual value of articles manufactured in the United States is five hundred and fifty millions of dollars. This statement does not include iron, salt, coal, sugar, wool, the products of fisheries, and other articles on which a duty is collected; adding these, swells the amount to nearly seven hundred millions. Our imports for that year were unusually large, on account of the famine abroad. Nevertheless, all the articles imported, on which a duty is collected, including the above omitted in the statement of manufactures, are in value only one hundred and eleven millions, one hundred and fifty-four thousand, three hundred and fifteen dollars. It thus appears that the amount manufactured in the country is more than six times that imported. It is not pretended, however, that this comparison affords a proper measure of the amount of the burden which the country may sustain; and that, while it pays to the government thirty-three millions, it pays two hundred to the manufacturers indirectly, thereby making the whole loss to consumers, in the first instance, two hundred and thirty-three millions. Some few articles are manufactured here as cheaply as they can be elsewhere; and a very large number, at the places where they are made, are cheaper to the consumer than would be the foreign article when transported there. It is also true, however, that in a great many cases the consumer loses even more than the whole duty, because he is not only obliged to pay it to the manufacturer or refund it to the importer, but also a profit or per cent. on this duty to each trader through whose hands the article passes before it reaches him. In other instances, the price is intermediate between what it would be without any duty, and that which it would amount to by the addition of the duty. Want of accurate knowledge of all the facts renders it impossible to determine precisely the effect which our revenue system produces; but that it is most powerful and controlling cannot be denied. The government actually raises more than thirty millions per year by these duties. The manufacturers, who certainly are interested in selling their productions at a high rather than a low rate, and who understand their true interests, attach the greatest importance to the tariff system, and attribute to its operation effects even greater than I have stated them to be.

There has been less complaint among consumers, because the cost of most manufactured articles has been diminishing from time to time. This fall of prices, however, is partly attributable to the great discoveries made during our day in chemistry, mechanism, and the arts generally, by which these articles are produced with much more facility. It is also attributable to the comparative repose of the world, which has directed capital and labor, formerly consumed in wars, to industrial pursuits. Hence, though there is a gradual reduction of prices in the United States, yet it is still more striking on the other side of the Atlantic. In Great Britain particularly, as well as in certain portions of the Continent, such is the accumulation of capital, and so great the number of laborers who are obliged to work for a mere subsistence, that prices are at the lowest possible rate. We have a right to take

advantage of this state of things, just as the Europeans do of our cheap production of cotton. Instead of giving us a half dollar a pound, as they used to do, they, as well as the people of the Northern States, seem glad to get it for five cents per pound, in consequence of our over production of the article. We have, therefore, a natural right to purchase their productions at the lowest rate at which we can obtain them, to counterbalance the disadvantage we suffer from the accumulation of a different kind of capital and labor. To alleviate this burden, we of the South get back very little in the form of protection. Why, then, have Southern men been willing to submit to a system so unequal in its operation! Because, as I have formerly had occasion to state, in the Convention which made the Federal Constitution there was a bargain made between the North and the South, that, provided they would allow our slaves to be represented, to permit importation for a time, and to deliver up fugitives, the South would, on its part, agree that a *majority* of Congress might have power to pass navigation or tariff laws. As the gift of the power under the circumstances necessarily implied that it was to be exercised, we felt bound in honor to acquiesce in the action of the majority. Because in the second place, protection to such extent as might give our infant manufactures a fair start, was calculated to advance the interest of the nation as a whole, though for the time it might bear hardly on us. And because, thirdly, we hoped that the Southern States would after a time get to manufacturing themselves, as their interest required them to do, and thus escape the burden. It was thus that Southern gentlemen, even after the North had partially failed to pay its share of the consideration, with great magnanimity continued to sustain the system.

The manner of disbursement is also adverse to our interests. Of the forty odd millions which the government purposes to disburse this year, I do not believe that five millions will in any way be expended in all the slaveholding States. North Carolina, for example, is burdened to the extent of not less than four millions, and yet does not get back one hundred thousand dollars in any way from the government. The clear loss, in a pecuniary point of view, on account of the action of the government, may be set down at not less than three millions annually. The Southern States generally are in the same situation.

What would be our condition if we separated from the North? It is difficult to determine the precise amount of the exports of the slaveholding States, because it is not practicable to arrive at the exact value of that portion which is sold to the free States. But the amount of our leading staples being pretty well known—I mean cotton, rice, tobacco, sugar, &c.—we can arrive at the whole value of our exports pretty nearly. They cannot fall short of one hundred and thirty millions of dollars, and this year, perhaps, considerably exceed that sum. This is nearly as much as the whole of the exports of the United States to foreign countries. It must be remembered, however, that though the free States furnish part of our exports, yet that which they do afford is scarcely so much as the portion of our own products which goes to them for consumption. If, therefore, we were separated, our

whole exports to the North and to foreign countries, generally, would be equal to that sum. Of course we should import as much, and in fact do at this time consume as much. A duty of thirty per cent. on these imports (and most of the rates of the present tariff law are higher) would yield a revenue of nearly forty millions of dollars. As the prices of almost all manufactured articles are regulated by the production of the great workshops of Europe, where the accumulation of capital and labor keeps down production to the lowest possible rates, I have no doubt but that sum would be raised without any material increase of the prices which our citizens now pay. We might, therefore, expend as much as the government of the United States ever did in time of peace, up to the beginning of General Jackson's administration, and still have on hand twenty-five millions of dollars to devote to the making railroads, opening our harbors and rivers, and for other domestic purposes. Or, by levying only a twenty per cent. duty, which the Northern manufacturers found ruinous to them, as they said, under Mr. Clay's compromise bill, we should be able to raise some twenty-five millions of dollars. Half of this sum would be sufficient for the support of our army, navy and civil government. The residue might be devoted to the making of all such improvements as we are now in want of, and especially chequering our country over with railroads. Subjecting the goods of the North to a duty, with those from other foreign countries, would at once give a powerful stimulus to our own manufactures. We have already sufficient capital for the purpose. But if needed, it would come in from abroad. English capitalists have filled Belgium with factories. Why did this occur? Simply because provisions were cheaper there and taxes lower than in England. The same motives would bring them into the Southern country, since both the reasons assigned are much stronger in our case. It has already been proved that we can manufacture some kinds of goods more cheaply than the North. In New England, too, owing to her deficient agriculture, everything is directed to manufacturing, and the system is strained up to a point which is attended with great social disadvantages, so as to retard population. In the South it need not be so. The climate and soil are very favorable to agricultural pursuits. Our slaves might be chiefly occupied on the farms, while the poorer class of our population, and a portion of our females, could be advantageously employed in manufacturing. We should thus have that diversity in our pursuits which is most conducive to the prosperity and happiness of a people.

Our carrying trade would probably for a time be in the hands of the English and other foreigners. This, however, would not be to our disadvantage, since Northern shipowners now, by reason of the monopoly which the existing law gives them, charge as much for freight between New York and New Orleans as they do to Canton, on the opposite side of the globe. The whole amount of the freight on southern productions, received by the North has, on a minute calculation, been set down at forty millions, one hundred and eighty-six thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight dollars (40,186,728.) The whole value which the North derives from its Southern connection

has been estimated, by some persons most familiar with these statistics, at more than eighty-eight millions of dollars. Whoever looks into the condition of the different States prior to the formation of the Union, and compares it with their situation at first, under low duties, up to the war and tariff of 1816, and its successors, highly protective as they have been, will find the facts fully sustaining the opinions I have expressed. Northern writers of elementary books, made for school children, of course represent things differently, and deceive the careless and ignorant. My opinions on these points have been settled for a long while past, though I have not heretofore been in a position where I thought I could exert any controlling influence, or effect any desirable object, by giving utterance to them.

In throwing out these views, Mr. Chairman, I have not sought the utmost degree of precision, but I have no doubt but that all the facts will be found on examination not less favorable to my conclusions than I have stated them. My purpose now is simply to present to Northern gentlemen such general views as are likely now to be adopted by the South. Your course of aggression is already arraying against you all the highest minds of the South men of high intellect, and higher patriotism, whose utter indifference to all personal considerations will make them, in the language of my eloquent friend from Georgia, (Mr. Toombs) "devote all they have and all they are to this cause."

But gentlemen speak of the difficulty of making the boundary; and the condition of the border States of Maryland and Kentucky are particularly referred to. Undoubtedly each State would have the right to determine for itself to which section of the confederacy it would belong. If these two States were to unite with the North, then, as it would not be possible for them to change their condition immediately with respect to slavery, if they ever did, they would for many years, at least, form a barrier against the aggressions of the free States, until, in short, the South would have become too great and powerful to need such aid. I take it, however, that their interest would lead them to prefer an association with the South. With reference to fugitive slaves, Maryland would not be materially worse off than I have shown her to be, if she were not in fact less molested. There would, however, be some great countervailing advantages. She is in advance of most of the Southern States in manufactures, and a duty on Northern imports would give her for the time better prices on such things as now come from the North. Baltimore would, perhaps, from its considerable size and its capital, become the New York of the South. New York itself must at once lose more than half its foreign trade. Charleston and New Orleans would expand rapidly. The like might occur to the cities of Virginia. Even the little towns on the eastern coast of my own State would more than recover the trade which they had prior to the war duties and tariff of 1816. The northern tier of counties in Kentucky would perhaps be obliged to remove their slaves to the South. But there would be to her advantages in the change, similar to those of Maryland. Kentucky supplies the South with live stock to a great extent; but she has to encounter the competition of Ohio and other Northwestern States. If the productions of these States were subjected

to a duty, she might for a time have a monopoly in the trade. I would do injustice to these two States if I supposed that they would be governed solely or even mainly by calculations of interest. Maryland and Kentucky are filled with as courageous, as generous, and as noble-minded men and women as exist on earth; and following their bold impulses, they would make common cause with their oppressed sisters of the South, and, if necessary take their places where the blows might fall thickest, in the front of the column, with the same high feelings that animated their ancestors on the battle-fields of the Revolution. Rather than that they should separate from us, I think it far more probable that some of the northwestern free States would find it to their advantage to go with the South. But we have been threatened that the North will take possession of the Lower Mississippi. The British tried that in 1815, but found Andrew Jackson and some of the Southwestern militiamen in the way. In the thirty-five years that have since passed, those States have become populous and strong, and would doubtless be able to protect their waters from aggression. The Southern States having now a free population of six millions, and producing in succession such soldiers as Washington, Jackson, Scott, and Taylor, need have no serious fears of foreign aggression.

I submit it, then, Mr. Chairman, calmly to Northern gentlemen, that they had better make up their minds to give us at once a fair settlement; not cheat us by a mere empty form, without reality, but give something substantial for the South. We might acquiesce in the Missouri compromise line. I should individually prefer, under all the circumstances, giving up the whole of California, provided we could have all on this side of it, up to about the parallel of 40° , not far from the Northern line of the State of Missouri, rather than its Southern— $36^{\circ} 30'$. We would thus, by getting the whole of New Mexico, and having the mountain chain and desert on the west, obtain a proper frontier. We might then acquire, at some future day, whether united or divided, possession of the country along the Gulf of Mexico, well suited to be occupied by our slave population. I mean, sir, that no restriction ought to be imposed by Congress on this territory, but that after it has been left open to all classes for a proper period, the majority may then, when they make a State Constitution, determine for themselves whether they will permit slavery or not. The South will acquiesce in any reasonable settlement.

But when we ask for justice, and to be let alone, we are met by the senseless and insane cry of "Union, union!" Sir, I am disgusted with it. When it comes from Northern gentlemen who are attacking us, it falls on my ears as it would do if a band of robbers had surrounded a dwelling, and when the inmates attempted to resist, the assailants should raise the shout of "Peace—union—harmony!" If they will do us *justice*, we do not need their lectures. As long as they refuse it, their declarations seem miserable, hypocritical cant. When these things come from Southern men, I have even less respect for them. Even the most cowardly men, when threatened with personal injury, do not usually announce in advance that they mean to submit to all the chastisement which an adversary may choose to inflict. And those

persons who, seeing the aggressive attitude of the North, and its numerical power, declare in advance that for their parts they intend to submit to whatever the majority may do, are taking the best course to aid our assailants, and need not wonder if the country regards them as enemies of the South.

If Northern gentlemen will do us justice on this great question, we may consent to submit to lesser evils. We may acquiesce in a most oppressive revenue system. We may tolerate a most unequal distribution of the public expenditures. We may bear the loss of our fugitive slaves, incurred because the Legislators of the Northern States have nullified an essential provision of the Constitution, without which the Union could not have been formed, because mere pecuniary considerations are not controlling with us. We may even permit such portions of the Northern people as are destitute of proper self-respect, to send up here occasionally representatives whose sole business seems to be to irritate as much as possible Southern feeling, and pander to the prejudices of the worst part of the Northern community. We may allow that the Northern States shall keep up and foster in their bosoms abolition societies, whose main purpose is to scatter fire-brands throughout the South, to incite servile insurrections, and stimulate, by licentious pictures, our negroes to invade the persons of our white women. But if, in addition to all these wrongs and insults, you intend to degrade and utterly ruin the South, *then we resist*. We do not love you, people of the North, well enough to become your *slaves*. God has given us the power and the will to resist. Our fathers acquired our liberty by the sword, and with it, at every hazard, we will maintain it. But before resorting to that instrument, I hold that all constitutional means should be exhausted. It is, sir, a wise provision of Providence that less force is required to resist an attack than to make it. The Constitution of the United States has been well framed on these principles. While, therefore, a majority is necessary to pass a measure, one-fifth of the members may demand the yeas and nays. In spite, therefore, of any change of rule which the majority can make, as long as this constitutional provision stands, a minority of one-fifth or more, if firm, and sustained by the people at home, can stop the wheels of the government. If it is ascertained that no proper settlement can be gotten of the Territorial question, it would be in the power of the Southern members to defeat all the appropriation bills, and bring the government to a dead halt. Perhaps it might be well to give such a cup to Northern gentlemen; for I well remember that when the civil and diplomatic appropriation bill was under consideration, with the amendment from the Senate known as Walker's, which would have settled the question of slavery in the Territories, a number of Northern gentlemen resolved to defeat that bill and all other business by constantly calling for the yeas and nays, if they did not succeed in striking out that amendment. I recollect perfectly, that while I was pressing a Pennsylvania member to vote against striking out that amendment, which was the pending motion, a member of high standing from Massachusetts said to me, "You need not give yourself any trouble about this matter; if we do not succeed in changing it, we shall

prevent its adoption by having the yeas and nays on motions to adjourn, and calls of the House, till the end of the session." From similar declarations made to me by a number of Northern gentlemen, as I went through the House, I had no doubt, but that, as he said, enough had agreed to have enabled them to effect their purpose, if the motion to change the character of the amendment had failed. It is not long since, too, that another citizen of Massachusetts (Mr. John Davis) defeated the two million bill then pending in the Senate, by speaking till the end of the session. As Northern gentlemen have therefore been accustomed to this mode of resistance to such measures as they do not like, I take it, that they would hardly complain of this kind of retaliation.

I tell gentlemen that, if we cannot in advance get a fair settlement of this question, I should be pleased to see the civil and diplomatic bill, the army and navy bill, and all other appropriations, fail. We should thereby make every officer and every expectant of public money directly interested in having justice done to the South. It would be far better to have this temporary inconvenience for a year or two, than that we should see a bloody revolution, or something worse. I hold it to be the duty of every Southern representative to stay here and prevent, till the close of our official term, the passage of any measures that might tend to force our people to unjust submission. In the meantime, the Southern States could, in convention, take such steps as might be necessary to assert their right to a share in the public territory. If this interregnum were to continue long, it might drive both sections to make provisional governments, to become permanent ones in the end.

But it is advised, in certain portions of the Northern press, that the members from that section ought to expel such as interrupt their proceedings. Let them try the experiment. I tell gentlemen, that this is our slaveholding territory. We do not intend to leave it. If they think they can remove us, it is a proper case for trial. In the present temper of the public mind, it is probable that a collision of the kind here might electrify the country, as did the little skirmish at Lexington the colonies in their then excited state. Such a struggle, whoever might prove the victors in it, would not leave here a quorum to do business. Gentlemen may call this *treason*—high treason—the highest treason ever known. But their words are idle. We shall defeat their movement against us. But even if I thought otherwise, I would still resist. Sooner than submit to what they propose, I would rather see the South, like Poland, under the iron heel of the conqueror. I would rather that she should find the fate of Hungary.

It was but the other day, and under our own eyes, that the gallant Hungarians asserted their independence. Though in the midst of, and struggling against those two immense empires, that could bring more than a million of armed men into the field, they were successful at first in beating down the power of Austria. It was not until some of her sons became *traitors* that Hungary was finally overpowered, borne down, and pressed to death by the long columns and gigantic strength of Russia. If necessary, let such be our fate.

"Better be
Where the extinguished Spartans still are free,
In their proud charnel of Thermopylæ."

Rather let the future traveller, as he passes over a blackened and desert waste, at least exclaim, "Here lived and died as noble a race as the sun ever shone upon." If we were to wait until your measures were consummated and your coil, like that of a great serpent, was completely around us, then we might be crushed. Seeing the danger, we have the wisdom and the courage to meet the attack now, while we have the power to resist. We must prove victors in this struggle. If we repel the wave of aggression now, we shall have peace. The Abolitionists defeated before the country on the main issue, will not have power to molest us.

I have thus, sir, frankly spoken my opinions on this great question, with no purpose to menace, but only to warn. Gentlemen of the North ought themselves to see that, while submission to what they propose would be ruinous to us, it would not in the end be beneficial to their section. Seeing, then, the issue in all its bearings, it is for them to decide. They hold in their hands the destiny of the existing government. Should circumstances divide us, I wish that you may prosper. From all my knowledge of the elements of your society, I have doubts. That we shall, under the favor of Providence, in all events, take care of ourselves, I have no fears. In conclusion, I have to say, do us justice and we continue to stand with you; attempt to trample on us, and we separate.

NOTE.

This speech being published in the two Washington dailies, the *New York Herald* and other papers, and coming as it did from one previously regarded as a zealous Whig, and a decided Union man, was read with great astonishment. Papers favorable to the Northern view denounced it in strong language, and as treasonable, while in the South there was a general surprise on account of its views, and a desire to ascertain whether its representations were to be verified by the developments of the session.

On previous occasions, dilatory motions, with calls of the ayes and noes, had been resorted to for temporary purposes, or to prevent action for a day on some question. My suggestion to use these means with a deliberate purpose to defeat action on the slavery issues, which might be unjust, and if extreme views were persisted in by the Northern members, to employ dilatory proceedings to the extent even of defeating the appropriation bills, was regarded with incredulity at first. After a few weeks trial, however, it was seen that these means might prove most formidable for defense. The papers at that time spoke of it as "*the Clingman process*," and it became evident that the admission, for example, of California as a separate proposition, or the passage of other measures proposed, might be indefinitely resisted. Mr. Clay, who with Mr. Webster and others had insisted on the admission of California by itself, saw that a different policy might become necessary. On meeting me one day in the passage near the Senate, he said: "Clingman, how did you get that idea of calling the ayes and noes to defeat measures?" I replied, "I will tell you exactly, Mr. Clay, when it occurred to me. About a week before the meeting of Congress, being here in the city, after I went to bed my anxiety as to the condition of the country made me so restless, that I could not sleep, and sometime between midnight and day the thought, suddenly flashed into my mind like electricity, and it excited me so much that I sprang out of bed and walked up and down my room for at least half an hour in the dark and cold before I could lie down again." "Well," said he, with

an indignant look, "it is just such an idea as I suppose a man would get between midnight and day."

Mr. Webster, in a conversation I had with him a few days before his seventh of March speech, took the matter even more seriously, so that for nearly two years we barely spoke when we met, but at the end of that time, by his own act, cordial relations were restored.

Surprise is often expressed that, while Mr. Webster's speeches as read seem to be superior to Mr. Clay's, yet Mr. Clay's influence and popularity were vastly greater. In order that young men especially, may understand this, it will perhaps not be out of place for me to refer to certain of Mr. Clay's peculiarities. I may in so doing be subjected to the criticism of certain persons. Though Mr. Clay was impulsive at times and occasionally irascible, and in fact, as Mr. Mangum, his most intimate and devoted friend, said, "On some occasions he is the worst mannered man in America;" yet he never bore malice. His patriotism or public spirit would not only induce him, when necessary, to control mere personal antipathies, and he was disposed to like every one whom he regarded as sincere and honest.

Again, being very ambitious of success in what he desired to accomplish, he with consummate tact, not only made friends, but sought to retain them. Therefore, both from public and also from personal motives, he used his great powers to secure and retain as large a body of followers as possible. He would not allow trivial circumstances to induce him to give up his ascendancy over those whom he liked, or thought he could make useful, provided he regarded them as true men.

In illustration of these characteristics of his, I will refer to several incidents, trivial in themselves, but which serve to illustrate the character and qualities of one, who was pronounced by Mr. Adams "the greatest parliamentary man in the world," on the occasion when he described the interview of the Democratic Senators with President Tyler. In fact, he probably made more personal friends than any man who ever lived.

On my calling to see Mr. Clay on his arrival at the beginning of the session, immediately after shaking hands with me he said, "What business have you writing letters to Foote?" This was said not because he entertained any personal objections to Senator Foote, but merely because he regarded him as an extreme Democrat, leaning towards disunion. It was singular and somewhat amusing to find that in the course of a few months, Mr. Clay and Mr. Foote became very intimate, and worked most harmoniously together to carry through the so-called compromise measures of that session.

In December, soon after the day on which Mr. Toombs made his "discord speech," President Taylor's first formal dinner party was given. It happened that Mr. Clay and I were both among the guests invited, and on our meeting in the parlor he said, "Clingman, what did you mean by clapping Toombs' speech to-day?" The speech had created great excitement and been applauded by many, and I had then observed that Mr. Clay was in the hall of the House. I replied, with affected levity, that the speech was so splendid that I did not see how any one could help applauding it. After dinner, while we were putting on overcoats in the dressing room, he looked at me earnestly, and with an expression in which regret seemed to predominate over displeasure, he said: "Clingman, I don't like your clapping Toombs."

Though subsequently during the session he knew I was actively opposing the measures he was pressing, instead of showing anger or becoming repellant in his manner, if I omitted for many days at a time to visit him, on a casual meeting he would say, "Why have you not been to see me? I expect you have been in mischief; come and report to me." On a certain evening

when, after he had been urgent in speaking of his measures, on my expressing strongly my objections, he seemed to become violently angry, and with his right hand seized me by the back of the neck with a grasp of some violence and said, "We shall have to hang such men as you are." On my turning towards him with some effort and saying "You have been called a dictator, but you now have a stubborn subject," his manner instantly changed; letting my neck go, he said: "Well, we won't quarrel about it, let us go in to tea," and running his arm inside of mine, we walked into the supper room.

This incident will remind some persons of an occurrence which has heretofore been made public, that happened between him and General Scott. At the Harrisburg Convention, by the efforts of General Scott's friends in part at least, Mr. Clay had been superseded and Harrison nominated. Mr. Clay regarded General Scott as to some extent responsible for this. On entering a room one evening where General Scott and some parties were seated at a table playing whist, Mr. Clay grasped Scott's shoulder with such violence that the General exclaimed, "Mr. Clay you are hurting my wounded shoulder." "Ah," said Mr. Clay, "I always believed, Scott, that there was a bad place in you." Scott instantly sprang up, but the interference of friends present, at once reconciled them.

Mr. Clay was so fine an actor when he chose to be one, that it was sometimes not easy to decide whether he was in earnest, or merely playing for amusement. The following story was told me by one who said he was present on the occasion. After the first bank bill had been passed, and while there was suspense and anxiety felt as to whether President Tyler would sign it or not, there was a social gathering of many prominent Whigs, to which the President had been invited. He did not arrive until the guests generally had assembled. On seeing him enter, Mr. Clay met him in the middle of the room, and as he confronted him, said in a tone loud enough to be heard by all present: "Mr. President, show us your hand; what are you for?" Mr. Tyler seemed disconcerted and embarrassed by such a sudden assault, and appeared at a loss as to his reply. Mr. Clay after enjoying his confusion for a few moments, suddenly turned to the left, and waving his hand towards the sideboard said, "Will you take wine or brandy?"

No one could be more graceful and urbane in manner than Mr. Clay usually was, nor was any one more ready to correct a wrong, if such had occurred. His general manner was that of a man perfectly brave who had nothing to conceal. His knowledge of character was not only remarkable, but he had a most wonderful intuitive perception of the then state of mind of the person he met, and hence he at once knew how to address him so as to make the most agreeable impression.

The difference between him and Mr. Webster in these respects may be illustrated by some occurrences between the latter and myself. Not long before Mr. Webster's speech on the seventh of March, 1850, was delivered, at the suggestion of Mr. Mangum and some other friends, I sought an interview with Mr. Webster. He invited me into one of the rooms adjoining the Senate Chamber. I commenced the conversation by saying that he was expected to speak on the subject, &c. He interrupted me by saying in rather a stern manner, "If I speak it will not be to add to the excitement in the country." This was evidently intended as a rebuke to me for the speech recently made. When I went on to speak of the importance of dividing the new territory so as to give permanent peace, and said the amendment to the fugitive law would be no adequate equivalent, and that, in fact, it would be fruitless of benefit, and would merely strengthen the abolitionists, he became ruffled in his temper. Seeing that I was making no favorable impression on him, I

said that unless some general settlement could be effected the separate measures would not be allowed to pass. He became more angry and replied, "Sir, social relations cannot be kept with gentlemen who maintain such extreme views." I immediately rose, and as I turned my back on him to go out, said: "I care nothing about that; these views will be maintained and they will be successful." Instead of being made angry by this remark I was only amused, knowing Washington society as I did. Mr. Webster himself doubtless soon lost his angry feelings, for during the session he took the position which I had desired him to occupy on the pending issues, but his manner when we met casually seemed constrained or sullen. He possibly might have entertained the idea that I would cherish angry feelings towards him.

When, in the winter of 1851 and 1852, Kossuth was in Washington, it was proposed to give him a public dinner, and I had been somewhat prominent in the movement. When the day on which the dinner was to take place arrived on my return to my lodgings I found a card of Mr. Webster, then Secretary of State, had been left for me. In the evening, before the time for the dinner had arrived, Mr. Charles Lanman, Mr. Webster's Secretary, and one of my personal friends, called to see me and said that he understood that there had been some misunderstanding between Mr. Webster and myself, of the causes of which he knew nothing, and that he merely wished to say that Mr. Webster desired that it should be forgotten, and that he would like to meet me that evening. When Mr. Webster arrived at the National Hotel, where the dinner was to be given, I met him in the parlors. After the usual salutation he said, "Clingman, why can you not let old things *be old things*, and come and see us as you used to do. Mrs. Webster notices that you do not call to see us as you formerly did." I replied that I had been very busy, &c., but that I would call soon.

On the next day I merely left my card, as he had done. Some weeks later Mr. Crittenden, the Attorney General, invited his friends to a supper given at one of the hotels. In the course of the evening Mr. Webster and I getting together, he said: "Why is it that you do not come and see us as you used to do." I answered that I had been rather unwell and very much occupied, &c. He conversed a good deal that evening about wine and the grape culture among other things. Perhaps a month or two after this I had occasion to call at the State Department to see Mr. Lanman. Immediately after I entered the room he asked me to excuse him for a moment, and walked into the adjoining room where Mr. Webster was. Soon after Mr. Webster came in, and invited me to take a seat opposite to him, at a small table, and said, "There have been some misunderstandings between us in the past, but it is time they should be forgotten. Mrs. Webster will have some ladies to visit her soon whom you know and like, and you must come and see us." In the course of two or three weeks I received an invitation to dinner, which, of course, was accepted. After the dinner was over at which he remained a good while, considering that his health was feeble, on his retiring it was remarked that he had not for a long while conversed as much at one time as he did on that occasion.

The Whig Convention was approaching and one of my published letters had commended Mr. Webster's great efforts for the country, and he also knew that I had at Baltimore endeavored to induce the Southern delegations to give him a solid vote.

In the latter part of August I had occasion to see him on some business. Entering the ante-room occupied by Mr. Lanman, I gave my card for Mr. Webster to the mulatto man who acted as messenger. He came back imme-

diately, and said, "Mr. Webster is busy, but will see you in a few moments." Within a minute afterwards Mr. Webster came himself to the door to speak to Mr. Lanman. He looked surprised at seeing me, and said, "Are you here, why did you not let us know it?" I answered that I had sent in my card, but that I had been told that he was busy at the time. He replied, "they never let me know it, or I would not have let you wait a moment. Now," said he, after we shook hands, "I am going up to Massachusetts, to Marshfield, and if you will come up to Boston I will send two coaches for you." I answered, "One will be enough." "No," said he quickly, "I will send two, and if you delay your coming long, I may be up in New Hampshire, and if you come up there Mrs. Webster has a bed in a corner for you. When you get to Boston you can find out where I am. You know my son Fletcher? he has a law office in town and he can tell you where I am. Any merchant in Boston can tell you." He paused an instant and repeated, "Fletcher will tell you where I am, and any merchant can tell you." Though a little thinner than usual and somewhat paler, I thought I had never seen him look more intellectual and grand than he did then. In six weeks I heard of his death.

Those who knew Mr. Webster well will recognize some of his peculiarities in this narrative, and it may give strangers to him a better idea of the differences of manner between him and Mr. Clay. Though I was much more frequently with Mr. Clay, yet his features are not so well marked in my memory as are those of Mr. Webster. In fact, Mr. Webster's countenance and figure comes up more frequently and vividly before me than those of any one else.

These incidents, in themselves unimportant, nevertheless tend to show why Mr. Webster's personal popularity and influence were so much less than Mr. Clay's. In such a case as this Mr. Clay would not have thought for a moment of manifesting his dislike in such a mode, and as soon as his feelings changed he would at once have promptly terminated the misunderstanding. The course taken by Mr. Webster might have so offended many persons as to render them enemies and cause them to endeavor to throw obstacles in his way.

Mr. Webster never seemed better satisfied for the moment than when seated at the head of his own table with a large salmon, the present of some friend from Maine, before him, with a dozen friends around, and an abundance of pleasant viands and good wines. He was reported to have said good humoredly, "I do not know why you Southerners should not like me, for I am as fond of good eating and drinking as you are, and they say that I am rather careless about my debts."

Two of his most remarkable traits ought, perhaps, to be referred to. Such was his mental constitution that he could not argue earnestly against his convictions of right. He was the very opposite of those men, who are said to be capable of arguing as well on the wrong, as on the right side of a question. Mr. Webster never dealt in sophistry, and his speeches were but the statements of his convictions. So free was he from prejudice and so decided was his love of truth, and so strong was his sense of justice, that if in the examination of a question he saw that the merits were not with him, he ceased to struggle against his convictions.

But, on the other hand, his indecision at times, or hesitation as to the line of action he would take, greatly diminished his influence. On one occasion when he and Mr. Mangum were co-operating as to a certain policy, the latter being worried with some hesitation on the part of Mr. Webster, said: "Mr.

Webster can make a speech to five hundred men and convince four hundred and ninety of them that he is right, and then he will be in doubt himself."

When a man does not seem to have confidence in himself, he cannot fasten others strongly to him. Had Mr. Webster possessed decision, firmness, perseverance, combativeness, that *visida vis* for which Clay, Jackson, Calhoun and Benton were so remarkable, he would have drawn to himself a much larger following, and exerted a much more powerful influence over the destinies of the country.

Of Mr. Mangum, having frequently mentioned him, it may not be out of place that I should say that next to Mr. Clay, he probably possessed at one period, more personal influence than any other individual then in Congress. This was singular, too, that though Messrs. Clay, Webster, Calhoun and Benton had differences among themselves, and some of them even were very unfriendly with each other, yet Mr. Mangum always was the friend of each one of them. His fine presence, too, good manners, great conversational powers, and high social qualities rendered him generally popular. With these gifts were joined in him, a most excellent judgment and extensive knowledge of all political matters.

To indicate the progress of the contest a letter is presented which was published in the *Republic*, March 22d, 1850. After referring to some personal attack, I went on to state in the words which follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, March 22, 1850.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE REPUBLIC:

* * * * *

"You have heretofore, while condemning ultra politicians, thought proper, in several of your editorials, to include me by name in that class.

But who are to be regarded as ultra politicians with reference to the great issue pending? The most ultra on the Southern side of the question that I know of, claim that slavery shall go into all the territories of the United States which are common property, until it shall be excluded by State Constitutions.

An ultra Northern man is he who claims that slavery shall be excluded from all the territory. If one of these views be more ultra than the other it must be the Northern one, because, even if the Southern view were adopted in practice, Northern men might occupy any part of the territory without being deprived of any legal advantage which they possess in their own States, and would have the further privilege, if they chose to exercise it, of holding slaves. If, however, slavery should be excluded, the Southerner would find himself deprived of certain advantages which he would enjoy at home.

Those men who, standing between these two opposite extremes, are willing that there should be an equitable division of the territory, may well claim to be the moderate men. In this class will fall, as far as I know, all the Southern members of Congress, as well as the entire mass of the Southern people. Whatever may be their views as to the powers of this government over the territory, they are willing, in fact, that there shall be a fair division.

The real question at issue, therefore, is not whether the South shall have *all the territory*, or even more than the North, but whether it

shall be permitted to possess *any part* of it. For example, if the Missouri line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ were extended to the Pacific, then all of the common property, viz: the territory not included within any of the States, only one-sixth part lies south of that line; yet when, on behalf of the South, we insist that this comparatively small part shall be left open to us, our claim is denounced as a monstrous pretension, as insufferable Southern arrogance.

With just as much fairness might the South be excluded from any share of the public money and other public property. Of the sum annually paid out of the public Treasury, a small part comparatively is expended in the slaveholding States. This portion of the disbursement the North might insist on stopping with as good a grace as they can support their present claim. To prove that if that sum were also expended in the free States it would be productive of greater good, they might use just the same arguments that they now resort to. While the principle would be the same, too, in each case, it is clear that the ultimate mischief to the South in the future will be much greater from the exclusion from all the territory than could result from depriving us of any share in the public money.

If these new principles, which seem to have been adopted by most of the Northern politicians, are to prevail; if this government is to acquire territory by conquest or by purchase, and the Southern States are to be required to furnish their full proportion of men and money, and then the fruits of victory are to be appropriated exclusively by the North, it is idle to suppose that the South will go into any such partnership.

The Southern people have been free too long to consent thus to become the vassals of the North. As their object is to obtain a recognition of their right to participate fairly in the benefits of the national territory, their opposition is not limited to a particular mode of exclusion, as the Wilmot proviso. It extends to all such action on the part of the Federal government as places it always against them and their institutions. If, for example, when territory is acquired in which slavery legally exists, as was the case with the Louisiana territory, then the government is directly to interfere, and by an act of Congress to abolish slavery, as it did in more than three-fourths of that territory; and when, on the other hand, an acquisition of a different character is made, it is intentionally so to manage as to exclude slaveholders from all parts of it; it is obvious that the character of our political system would be essentially changed; so that the government, instead of being that of the whole Union, would have been converted into a mere machine for the advancement of the Northern section.

By one mode of proceeding, for example, we are asked to admit California as a State forthwith. But New Mexico and Deseret are in just as much want of legislative aid, and their inhabitants are just as urgent in their demands for our action in their cases. Inasmuch, therefore, as the inhabitants of all these Territories are in the same situation, and have all presented us forms of government, why discriminate between them? Why grant the request of one set and refuse it to the others? Is it because California has made a Constitution excluding

slavery, while the other two Territories have not imposed any such restriction in their forms of government? Is it for this reason, I say, that we are to be required to admit her at once? If the majority from the North, instead of disposing of all these Territories at this time, they being equally entitled to our consideration, insist on pushing through California alone, is not the conclusion irresistible that it is their object merely to strengthen their hands, thus to enable them hereafter to secure the other portions of the Mexican territory by one mode or another?

Are Southern men to be required to stultify themselves so far before the country as to affect to be blind to this state of things? Could we settle the whole territorial question on equitable terms, we might be justified in waiving the strong objections to the manner in which this state of things was produced in California. The Northern members have not only, by decisive majorities, from time to time repeatedly during the last three years, passed the Wilmot proviso through the House of Representatives, but even at the last session, when Mr. Preston's bill to allow the people of that country to form a Constitution was under consideration, they appended that proviso to it, and thus obliged its friends to abandon it. The people of the country there, being thus persuaded that their only chance to get into the Union was by the exclusion of slavery, very naturally incorporated the proviso into their Constitution.

The course which you have to some extent pursued, however patriotic may be your motives, and more especially that of the *National Intelligencer*, seems to me calculated only to produce mischief. I refer to the attempt to underrate the condition of feeling at the South by extracts carefully culled from Southern papers, letters, &c. No impression is thereby made on the South. The subject being one which everybody there fully understands, opinions cannot be shaken in relation to it. Those persons who reason *know* that it is wrong that the South should not be permitted, with her institutions, to occupy any part of the common territory; such as are not accustomed to reason *feel* that the exclusion is a gross outrage on their rights. When any man, how high soever may be his position, declaims against the extension of slavery into any part of the territory, his words produce no more effect on the settled judgment of the South, than the dashing of the waves against the base of a mountain of solid granite. The only effect of these publications is to deceive the North. What possible good can result from keeping the people of that section in profound ignorance of the condition of things in the South? Is it wise thus to mislead the people there? Why not let them know that their movements may bring them into danger? Is it regarded as a wise stroke of policy, in a military commander, to conceal from his his own troops the danger, until he can bring them up suddenly upon a masked battery? If the Union be in peril, nothing seems to me better calculated to increase the danger than such a course as this.

Even if these quotations should be fairly made from the particular papers selected, it must be remembered that they constitute a small portion of those published in the Southern States. It may be re-

marked, too, that a number of these papers are published by Northern men, some of whom retain their original sectional feelings, and are adroitly endeavoring to advance the anti-slavery views of the North. Other journals, partly from a party feeling of opposition to movements which found in the first instance more favor in the Democratic papers, and partly out of deference to the tone of the central press in this city, supposed to be in accordance with the views of the administration, have echoed back what they supposed would be acceptable here. As, however, it has become manifest that they were unintentionally aiding the anti-slavery movement of the North, they have gradually been taking a better view of things; and I have no doubt but that, ultimately, all such of them as are governed by patriotic considerations will assume the proper position. The North is also misled by the fact that certain Southern men seem willing to sacrifice the general national interests of the Union, by abandoning the rights of their own section and adopting the narrow sectional claims of the North. Whether these persons are governed by misguided patriotism, or are merely seeking Northern support for their personal advancement, it cannot be expected that they should be sustained by those whose rights they are willing to surrender. If they have not already lost their influence, they will inevitably do so when their position is understood and the feeling has become intense. The effect of these things, however, can be productive of nothing but mischief, by misleading the North. Had the real state of feeling in the old thirteen colonies been understood in England six months before the declaration of independence, our revolution would never have occurred; but the British Parliament and people were cheated and deceived by the ministers and their organs, who declared, from time to time, that the complaint on this side of the Atlantic came only from a few ambitious and factious men, who were making a noise and exciting sedition to give themselves consequence; and that the great body of the inhabitants of the colonies were loyal, contented and quiet, and so attached to the general government and the union with Great Britain, that they would submit to whatever laws the Parliament might pass. With this example so familiar to American minds, is it not strange that similar delusion should now prevail?

But I will now advert to another point, viz: the means proposed to resist the improper action of the Northern majority. I have expressed the opinion that under our obligations to support the Constitution of the United States, all means consistent with its provisions should be exhausted before there should be a recommendation to appeal to our rights above it. And I have hence advised that, under all the circumstances, if an equitable adjustment cannot be obtained of the territorial question, then we ought to refuse to pass any appropriation bills for the support of the government. The idea of refusing supplies is not of American origin. It has been claimed in England as the undoubted right of the Parliament to refuse, at its own discretion, supplies to the executive. This right, too, has in practice from time to time been exercised to protect the rights and liberties of the people

of England, and has even been the means of extorting additional privileges from the British monarchs.

Will it be pretended that the representatives of American freemen ought to do less to protect the essential rights, and liberties even, of the people whom they represent? In England, however, nothing less than a majority of the representatives can do this; but under our Constitution the minority may effect the same object. Nobody will, I apprehend, affirm that the same act, *per se*, which would be proper when done by the majority, would be wrong if effected by the minority, acting in the manner provided by the Constitution itself. The act of the majority is only effective because the Constitution so declares; but this same Constitution provides also that certain acts, when done by the minority, shall be effective. This difference between our Constitution and that of Great Britain operates in behalf of liberty, and to protect the rights of the minority. It is in some respects like the Presidential veto, which everybody admits ought in certain cases to be exercised, though it does have the effect of defeating the action of the majority. The Constitution of the United States, under which alone Congress acts, provides that one-fifth of the members present may demand that the ayes and noes shall be taken on any question which may be submitted by the Speaker.

It is also provided that each House may adopt its own rules of order. Such rules have been adopted already by the House of Representatives, and are until modified or changed by the House itself, as much binding on the Speaker and every member as any constitutional provision whatever. In accordance with these rules, certain motions may be made, and the ayes and noes taken from time to time. Under the Constitution and these rules, one-fifth of those members present have undoubtedly the power to prevent the passage of laws, and to prevent also the adoption of any motions for a change of the old rules of the House. Unquestionably this is a power in the hands of the minority which might be abused; so, however, might any other power granted by the Constitution, whether given to the majority, the minority, or to a single individual, as the President, Judge, or other officer. If the minority, for mere factious or slight purposes, were thus to impede legislation, this would, undoubtedly, be a great abuse; but if that minority were, on the other hand, to resort to this system only temporarily, and as a matter of defence against a well-settled and gross system of injustice and tyranny on the part of the majority, then their conduct would not only be no abuse of its powers, but would, in fact, be a most praiseworthy and patriotic action for the protection of the essential rights of their constituents. No citizen has a right to strike another person; but if one is assailed and beaten, then he is justified in striking the assailant until he compels him to desist from his attack.

Since this mode of resistance was suggested, it seems to have been received with much favor by Southern men. From many evidences within my reach, I select the following passage from a letter to me, which seems to present fairly the view taken in the South, as far as I am able to understand it. The writer is not only one whose opinion

will have as much weight as that of any one in North Carolina, from his standing and talents, but is entitled to the more consideration from the fact that, during a service of many years in Congress, he was not less distinguished for his moderation and conservative views than for the firmness and ability with which he maintained them. As the letter from which I make the extract was a private one, I do not give the name of the writer, much as I might, by so doing, strengthen the judicious statement of the case made by him.* He says:

"I approve of your position to resist the passage of the appropriation bills until the slavery question is finally settled. This is a much better and more effectual plan than for Southern members to leave their seats, which I have seen proposed in some quarters. Should the Southern members merely leave their seats and return home, it will produce no result; the North will pocket the public money and laugh at them. The matter can be settled nowhere but upon the floor of Congress, except by a dissolution of the Union, which nobody desires. If fifty of our Southern members would lay aside all other party ties and act firmly and openly together, they can force the North to do what is right, and what she ought to do without hesitation. Resist all bills for the support of government until this subject is finally and satisfactorily settled, particularly the annual appropriation, the army and navy bills. Let it be distinctly understood that you will oppose these measures by every parliamentary tactic in your power, and that you cannot be bought off, forced off, nor coaxed off, until justice is done the South; and, in my judgment, success is inevitable. At all events, if I were there I would try the experiment until March 4, 1851.

"The South has no direct interest in the passage of these bills, and if the object of refusing them is understood, I have no doubt it will be cordially approved. Should Congress adjourn without passing these bills, there will very soon be organized a powerful party in the North to put down Free-soilism and Abolitionism both. I do not think we should be plagued with either again for some time. In a movement of this kind every thing depends on its being carried out by firm, honest and true men, and I hope enough such may be found in Congress to undertake it, in spite of all the clamor it will raise in the North and among those who live by the government. It is a harsh measure, but in my opinion it is the only one left to save the Union and protect the South. Desperate diseases require desperate remedies."

Should this means of resistance be adopted by the Southern members, there would be, I have no doubt, excitement at first and anger in the North. To allay it, however, if they are consistent and sincere in their expressions of devotion to the Constitution and laws, it would only be necessary for us to remind them of their own doctrine. If we complain of the threatened action of the majority, they advise us to refer the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, they say, is the great constitutional arbiter whose decisions all good

*Hon. Wm. B. Shepard.

citizens who love law and order must submit to. If they complained of this action of the minority, we, of course should recommend them to apply for redress to the Supreme Court. Should that august tribunal decide, for example, that one-fifth of the members present had not the right to demand the ayes and noes, then it would doubtless furnish to the complainants such remedial process as the Constitution of the United States and the laws provide in such cases. Should Northern gentlemen be so inconsistent as to decline to await the effect of this slow process, then they would probably attempt to change the existing rules of the House. But as these rules have been tried and approved by the American Congress for many years, they are as much revered in certain quarters as were the laws of the Medes and Persians in their day. In other words, Southern men, seeing how our country has prospered under these rules, may not choose to have them changed in any respect, and may resort to the same means to prevent a change as those above indicated. Should the majority in that contingency, as it has been threatened they will do, attempt to substitute their own rules, arbitrarily adopted, and to displace the existing Speaker because of his fidelity to the Constitution, then their conduct, being unlawful, forcible and revolutionary, would justify and require a forcible action on the part of the friends of the Constitution to resist their attempts. It would thus turn out that the Northern members, having in the first place been guilty of a tyrannical abuse of their powers under the Constitution, and finding that that instrument contained a provision for the protection of the minority, whose rights they had sought to trample on; this majority, I say, finding that they were balked in their efforts by the Constitution itself, would a second time put themselves in the wrong, by an appeal to force. In such a case we, who might use the means necessary to defeat this revolutionary movement, would be standing in defence of the Constitution and laws. Feeling the force of as high obligations as could possibly rest on a human being, I cannot doubt but that in this contingency Southern men will do their duty without regard to any personal peril that may be incurred.

One purpose of such a movement as this would be to teach the North that, under the powers granted in the Constitution both to majorities and minorities, great mischief in practice might be caused. An appeal would thus be made in the most solemn manner to the good sense and right feeling of the masses of the people there, and they might then decide whether or not they were willing to carry on our political system as we have heretofore done.

The time when we ought to resort to this mode of action, I hold, should be after a clear demonstration that the majority, by an arbitrary exercise of their power, intend to disregard the constitutional and natural rights of the southern portion of the confederacy. When this shall be made manifest, when we are brought to see that the powers of this central government are to be used against our people, that instead of being *their* government, it is to them a *foreign* and *hostile* government, then it is our duty to withdraw all support from it as far as our powers will enable us to do. Northern gentlemen, how-

ever, tell that us it would be more manly, and more becoming a high-minded and chivalrous people, to let legislation take its course, and resort to revolutionary remedies. Others of them place great reliance on the Federal army and navy, and say that without any trouble to the North they will, by blockading Southern ports and sending troops where they are needed, soon bring the South into submission to such laws as they may choose to pass. I have no doubt but that they are perfectly willing, as they say, to vote all the money in the treasury to have their acts executed.

But I tell these gentlemen frankly, that however willing I might be in matters that concerned myself alone, to make concession when there is an appeal to my magnanimity, I do not feel at liberty thus to act when the rights of others are at stake. I will not, if I have the power to prevent it, needlessly jeopardize those whom I represent. If there is to be a collision, I do not wish the sword of Brennus thrown into the scale against my section. If there is to be a struggle, in any event, between the South and the North, I desire that this, the common government, may stand as a neutral. If I have power, I will, in that event, put this government under bonds to keep the peace. As in that contest I know that the South will have the right on her side, I am not willing that the Federal army and navy shall be used against her. After the appropriations for the current year are expended, the President will have no more power to use the money in the treasury without an appropriation by law than any other person would have.

Whether Southern members will take the step indicated, I shall not assume to say in advance, nor even to assert that they have the political, moral and personal courage thus to defend their own section, should their judgment approve the course. These things the public must decide for itself, from such evidence as it has from time to time of Southern feeling and Southern action. Should this remedy be adopted, it must be temporary in its effects, and could hardly be expected to prove available after the 4th of March next. Then, and perhaps sooner, the Southern people, seeing that their representatives could no longer, by any exertion, protect them, would be compelled to rely on their own efforts.

There is at this time less manifestation of excitement in the Southern States than was exhibited a little while since. But no one ought to be deceived as to the real cause of this comparative quiet. This state of things is in no wise attributable to eulogies on the Union, nor to denunciation of Southern movements.

The people of the Southern States suppose they have seen indications sufficient to induce them to hope that there may be an equitable adjustment of the question at issue. Nothing has contributed more to this than the rejection, by the House of Representatives, of the resolutions of Messrs. Root and Giddings, embodying the principle of the Wilmot proviso. Throughout the South, generally, this has been regarded as an indication of a returning sense of justice in the minds of the majority. Other movements, since made here, contributed to the same result. The liberal views of certain Northern gentlemen have operated in the same direction. A great impression has been

made, on the Southern mind especially, by the able, manly and national speech of Mr. Webster; showing, as he did, that he had the statesmanlike sagacity to understand the real condition of the country, and the courage to meet the crisis. Avowing his readiness to do justice to all sections of the Union, according to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, he has by that effort contributed, in a most eminent degree, to raise the hope that the liberal and just men of the North would so far sustain him as in the end to lead to a fair adjustment of the difficulty. But should such not be the event—should the Southern people find that they have been deceived—there will be a renewal, with redoubled energy, of all the former manifestations of excitement.

No where among them is there to be found that spirit of slavish submission to wrong, which it has been sought to inculcate from certain quarters. The only question on which they are divided is, whether they ought in the condition of things just now, to speak, and act. Though silent they are resolute. The feeling of determination is daily spreading and extending itself in all directions. The instant it appears necessary for them to act they will move forward like a torrent that, after being obstructed for a time, has with gathered strength broken down all that barred its way. I trust, then, that those who have the power in their hands will at once decide to give us an equitable settlement. There is danger in delay, since each month that passes by leaves a wider gap between the two sections. For myself, while here as a member, I will use my official station to preserve as far as I can the Constitution intact in its letter and spirit, and to protect, if possible, from the threatened wrong, those whom I have the honor in part to represent. Failing in this, I shall be found with the people of the South in whatever movements they may find necessary to guard their safety and honor.

Respectfully yours,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

On the side of the South a constant effort was made to impress upon the people of the North the knowledge of the danger to be apprehended from the passage of the anti-slavery measures. I recollect that one day Mr. Thompson, a Democratic member from Pennsylvania, said to me, "We wish you Southern men to state the danger as strongly as you can, for if we were to give way now, our people would think we had been frightened for nothing, and would send in our places a set of abolitionists; but if they once can be made to see that there is real danger to the Union, then they would beat us if we did not give way."

With a view of developing the opinions of the Southern people more fully and uniting them on the best plan of action, for their safety and protection, a proposition was made for the holding of a convention at Nashville, Tennessee. This measure was denounced in the strongest terms by the anti-slavery press as treasonable; it was declared that the assembly ought to be dispersed by military force; and the people of Tennessee were exhorted not to permit their soil to be desecrated by such traitors. During the controversy, which was a most animated one, in reply to an invitation to a meeting at Charlotte, I addressed a letter, published in the *Hornet's Nest*, dated April 10, 1850, to "Wm. Johnston, Esq., Wm. R. Myers, Esq., Hon. J. W. Caldwell, Wm. Lander, Esq., John Walker, Esq., W. B. Hammond, Esq.,"

members of the committee, in which, after discussing the reasons for, and the propriety of holding such a convention, I used this language:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 10th, 1850.

* * * * *

The present frame of the Federal Government was created to advance certain objects, and while it does so it will be sustained and cherished by the people, but when it has been converted into an engine of oppression: when its powers are directed systematically to wage war on the institutions and property of half the States, those injured will draw from it their confidence and support.

The people of the South are impelled by no blind veneration for the forms of the constitution after its substance and spirit have departed. They are not actuated by a brutish feeling like that which the ape evinces when it carries its dead offspring in its embrace. This government being the work of the hands of the American people, is not the object of their stupid idolatry. When the Jews worshipped the golden calf, they had themselves made, they at least adored a harmless object. None but the lowest savage tribes under the influence of fear, the meanest of all feelings, make divinities of what they dread. If this government should then, as some are striving to make it, become an instrument to assail and oppress the parties to it, is it to be supposed that those against whom it is directed will uphold and reverence it?

Whether it will be necessary and proper to hold the convention at the time proposed is a point in relation to which there may well be difference of opinion, and which affords a proper field for discussion and argument. But I can find no justification or even colourable excuse for the manner in which that convention has been assailed and denounced by certain individuals and presses. It is not long since the people of the Northern States held a convention at Buffalo to advance objects contrary to the whole spirit of the constitution of the United States, and which, if carried into effect, would inevitably have destroyed the Union.

There are from year to year also conventions in the Northern States for the declared purpose of overturning the constitution of the United States and destroying the present Union, to enable them to invade more effectually the institutions of the South. These conventions are not gotten up on account of any practical grievance which affects the North, but only as they avow to enable them to assail the rights of the South. Yet there has been no effort to instigate men to break up these conventions by violence nor has the military power of the government been invoked against them.

For the first time since the foundation of the government, the Southern people, seeing their rights and even political existence are menaced seriously, and in the most alarming manner by these systematic movements at the North, have proposed to hold a Convention, to consult together and devise, and put in practice some plan of resistance, so as simply to protect themselves from the threatened wrong. And immediately a hue and cry is raised by their open assailants and such other persons as secretly sympathise with the anti-slavery party, and the military force

of the government is invoked to disperse or overawe the meeting. When they were subject to the British monarchy the people of the colonies were permitted to hold their Conventions or Congresses as they were then called, from year to year, to declare their grievances and devise means of resistance to the oppression with which they were threatened.

The Convention which met at New York in 1765, had a great influence in procuring a repeal of the stamp acts. Ten years later, failing by these means to obtain relief from other oppressive acts of the parliament, they, after meeting in Conventions from year to year, were finally obliged to make the Declaration of Independence.

At this day the British government does not dare attempt to prevent by force the large meetings held in Ireland, to effect a dissolution of the Union with Great Britain. Even the immense mass meetings of the Chartists having revolutionary objects in view have not been interfered with by the government. On the continent too, among the monarchies of Europe, the subjects are permitted not only to complain of their grievances but to demand changes in the forms of government. The monarchs on their thrones, sustained by immense standing armies, do not dare to interfere with these assemblages. The persons therefore who have undertaken in this manner to prevent the assembling of the Southern Convention, are actuated by ideas not American, not European, but Asiatic. The men having such a mental constitution, ought forthwith to leave the United States. They cannot with propriety stop in Europe, but will find the position that nature has fitted them for among the palace slaves of the Eastern despots. The fact that such men have the effrontery to declare these sentiments in the face of American freemen presents one of the worst symptoms of the times.

Should we obtain an honorable adjustment of these difficulties, it will be due entirely, gentlemen, to the determined feeling manifested by the Southern people and their representatives. Had the South presented an unbroken front, we should ere this have obtained a better settlement than we can hope for at this time. The anti-slavery or free soil party of the north were, for a time, encouraged by a few Southern traitors who gave them aid and comfort by telling them that the South would submit to anything which they might choose to impose. These people are losing the confidence of their northern allies in the cause of abolition and will probably soon be viewed by them with as much contempt as was Benedict Arnold by Englishmen after the Revolution.

* * * * *

Your obedient servant,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

On the other hand, the Union men, so called *par excellence*, labored earnestly to keep down all manifestations of Southern feeling, so as to prevent the North from changing its hostile attitude. They also strove as much as possible to quiet the Southern people, to prevent their understanding the truth, and to persuade them that no danger was to be apprehended, and that all that was being urged on behalf of the South, was intended to effect a dissolution of the Union. About the time of the session of the Nashville Convention, a body called by the Southern rights men, I met the Hon. Howell Cobb, who was a zealous Union man. On my asking him how

matters looked, he replied, with an expression of countenance in which great anxiety and sorrow were apparent, "Very bad; it seems almost certain that the resistance party will carry Georgia." Not many days afterwards, on our meeting, I asked him what he thought of the prospects. He answered, with great elation of manner, "First rate; we can carry Georgia on Rhett's speech." Soon afterwards, on my meeting Mr. Clay, he said, with a look of triumph, "Have you seen Rhett's speech? What do you think of that?" Mr. Rhett, after the termination of the session of the Nashville Convention, made a speech, in which he claimed that great progress was made towards disunion, and boastfully said that even "Tennessee had wheeled into line."

Mr. Rhett, with considerable ability, was a gentleman who could make himself particularly offensive to his opponents, and could even present a truthful proposition in such a manner as to render it distasteful. He was, on the Southern side, a political scarecrow, as Garrison and Giddings were on the Northern side; with this difference, however, that whereas the latter disclaimed connection with the Northern party, and thus relieved it of the odium that their violent speeches created, Mr. Rhett, on important occasions, sought to render himself as prominent as possible, and with merciless friendship, crippled his allies.

Gidding's declaration, that the slave ought to "keep his knife close to his master's throat," was better calculated "to fire the Southern heart" than the ablest speech a "fire-eater" could make. We occasionally see men who without the power, by any speech they can utter, to render the slightest aid to the party they profess to belong to, nevertheless, possess a negative influence as potently repellant as that of a fly in a bowl of soup. Napoleon once said that war was a succession of blunders in which those triumphed who made the fewest.

If a party were governed always by its wisest men, it would beat its adversaries easily, and might live forever.

In the progress of the struggle some events occurred, which came very near changing the entire order of the battle. They are set forth concisely, but with sufficient detail, perhaps, to make them well understood, in a letter heretofore published in the New York *Herald*, August 17, 1876, which is as follows:

WASHINGTON, August 13, 1876.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

My attention has been called to a letter of the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens which appears in your paper of the 8th inst., in which some references are made to me in connection with Messrs. Stephens and Toombs. I understand that there were some previous letters of Mr. Thurlow Weed in which mention was made of my name. The transactions which led to the mistake of Mr. Weed were in themselves sufficiently interesting to justify an elaborate article in one of the magazines of the day; but I shall content myself with as concise a statement as I can present to make the matter understood. I know much more of the transactions than any one else, but there are gentlemen living to whom all the several facts I shall refer to are known as far as they are material.

During the session of 1850, at which the compromise measures were passed, Mr. Clay resided at the National Hotel. I was also a boarder there, and, though opposing Mr. Clay's plan, I was in constant com-

munication with him. In fact, if several days had passed without my calling at his room in the evening, he would, on casually meeting me about the Capitol, say, "Where have you been all this while? I expect you have been in some mischief." He would say frequently, "I wish to hear from you all, and then I will decide for myself."

During a conversation one evening I said to him that there were three forces or obstacles to his scheme of compromise that were sufficient to defeat it, viz: First, the opposition of the anti-slavery party, led by such men as Mr. Seward; second, that of the administration of General Taylor, and third, that of the Southern rights men. That he would not win the support of Mr. Seward's party, because they desired to keep up sectional agitation for political effect, and were opposed, therefore, to any settlement, and that as the administration had a plan of its own, it would regard itself as defeated if any other form of settlement was adopted; but that the Southern men would be induced to co-operate if certain changes were adopted in his scheme of adjustment. That one of two things would bring him Southern votes enough to enable him to pass his bills—either to cut off the southern portion of California by the line of thirty-six thirty, or, what I preferred, to let California come in whole, and, as an equivalent, on the western border of Missouri, to change the line of thirty-six thirty to the fortieth parallel, and, after running it back to what was the eastern border of Utah, then deflect it to the south and extend it to the Pacific Ocean with the southern boundary of California. I had in a speech made in January previously, urged this plan. Mr. Clay rejected instantly the proposition to change the line of the Missouri Compromise. He also at first said, "You had as well talk of dividing the moon as California," but, after some further conversation, seemed to yield somewhat, though he left his purpose undecided, or at least did not then announce it.

A few evenings after this, on my meeting him, he said impetuously, and with seeming disappointment, "You were mistaken, for the Southern Senators will not support my plan, even if we agree to the division of California." He then stated that Senator Foote, of Mississippi, had that day spoken to Hunter, Soule, Yulee, and Turney, and that they all refused. I told him that such a hasty movement as that which he had tried was ill-judged and certain to have failed; that time was necessary to make the preliminary movements which, I felt confident would bring them in. I then explained in detail to Mr. Clay what I proposed should be done. It was in substance this:

General Taylor, it was understood, was then contemplating the use of the army to settle the dispute as to the boundary of Texas. There was alarm at the prospect of the country being precipitated into a civil war. The Southern Whigs especially were excited, feeling that they had already gone as far in their support of the extreme Northern views of their party as they could afford to do. My colleague, Mr. Outlaw; Mr. Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, and others, were disposed to abandon the administration if such a policy was insisted on. After finding that most if not all of the more moderate of the Southern Whigs concurred in these views, a caucus was called composed of

Southern Whigs alone. After a full interchange of views it was agreed that a proper effort should be made to induce General Taylor to change his policy, and in the event of failure so to change his purpose it was evident that the Southern Whigs, probably all with the exception of Mr. Stanley, would abandon the administration, cut loose from the Northern Whigs and act with the Democratic party. Three gentlemen were selected to confer with General Taylor—Mr. Charles M. Conrad, of Louisiana, a personal friend of General Taylor and a Representative from his own State; Mr. Humphrey Marshall, who had served under him in Mexico, and Mr. Toombs, who had been one of the most active and influential men in bringing forward General Taylor as a Presidential candidate. In order that there might not seem to be any menace implied in the movement, it was agreed that these gentlemen should converse with General Taylor separately. Mr. Conrad first saw him and stated to me the result of the interview. He said that the President was obstinately fixed in his purpose, and that his mind was so prejudiced that he regarded the opposition to his scheme as factious, and stimulated by Messrs. Clay and Webster from chagrin because he had superseded them as a Presidential candidate, while Cass was hostile on account of his defeat. Mr. Marshall soon after had an interview with a similar result. While speaking of it to me he burst into a fit of laughter, saying, "The old fellow takes the military view of the question; he said he had ninety men from the North and only thirty from the South (referring to the relative number of Whig members from the two sections), and asked, 'Am I to give up my ninety in the North for your thirty in the South?'"

Mr. Toombs did not see General Taylor until after he had been taken ill, but before he was supposed to be in danger. He became ill, it may be remembered, after attending the celebration of the Fourth of July, and died on the 9th. About the time of his death some of those papers which were in sympathy with Mr. Weed's views had exaggerated statements of Mr. Toombs' interview, and represented him as standing over the dying President and using threatening language to him. I presume that Mr. Weed's mistake is due to some vague recollections of these publications.

The death of the President changed the condition of the whole question, and the caucus did not reassemble again. The machinery with which the Southern Whigs were to be detached on this question from their Northern associates was destroyed. I had felt confident that General Taylor would refuse our request, and was equally confident that in such a contingency the Southern Whigs would unite with the democracy North and South, and under the lead of Mr. Clay, aided by General Cass, make a common war on the administration. As Mr. Clay's personal influence would have brought in a few Northern Whigs we should have had about two-thirds of the Congress, and would easily have carried a substantial measure of compromise. It would have been an extension of the Missouri line to the Pacific, or such a modification as would have been an improvement. We should have escaped the mischievous non-intervention ambiguity, which, in its results, verified the evil then apprehended from it. We should thus have

avoided the excitement resulting from the Kansas and Nebraska struggle, which expedited the collision between the sections many years, and likewise the split at Charleston, which precipitated the country into immediate war.

The death of General Taylor threw the issue again back into its condition of uncertainty. Mr. Clay changed his line of policy. He had refused to take the amendment of Norris, though he said it would if, adopted, give him four additional votes in the Senate for his bills. He now, however, decided to accept it. Toward the latter part of July I had some conversation with him in the Senate. That morning he was dressed all in spotless white, except his blue dress coat, and looked more buoyant in spirits than I had seen him during the session. On my reminding him of former conversations he said that he would take Norris' amendment and gain votes enough to pass the bill. I said: "Mr. Clay, you have been disappointed three times this session." With an impetuous wave of his hand and a haughty look, he said: "The administration was the only obstacle to the passage of my measures and I shall now carry them without difficulty." I walked across the chamber and spoke to Messrs. Hunter and Soule, who were standing together. It may be proper to explain that though they and their Southern associates would not support Mr. Clay's plan, yet they protected it from destruction by the attacks made on it by the Seward wing of its opponents, in the hope that it might ultimately be gotten into such a shape that they would support it. On my stating to them what Mr. Clay had decided on Mr. Hunter said, "Then you think we had better let it be destroyed." I told him I was decidedly of that opinion. Immediately afterward, as the record of the proceedings show, the compromise of Mr. Clay was cut to pieces, and a single plank in it, the Utah bill, was passed. On the morning afterward Mr. Clay made a denunciatory speech in the Senate and went up to Newport to recruit his health. Senator Pierce's bill, in certain respects more favorable to the South came in, and ultimately the series of measures were adopted called the Compromise of 1850.

Not having seen either of Mr. Weed's letters, I can only infer their contents from reading that of Mr. Stephens. I never had a conversation with Gen. Taylor on a political subject, unless it was a casual remark at one of his dinners or evening receptions. Nor did I ever hear of any one having such an interview as that spoken of by Mr. Weed. I scarcely think such a thing could have occurred without my knowledge, for I felt a great interest in the issue, was very active, seldom going to bed during that ten months' session till after two o'clock. Having learned who were the late sitters up I was able to occupy myself with interviews till a late hour in the evenings, and from week to week I was able to understand the position on the question of almost every member of each House during the session. The non-intervention scheme I considered as an ingeniously devised stratagem to produce a collision between the sections, because it was regarded at the North as making all the territory free, while at the South it was asserted that under it all the Territories were slaveholding. It is to me a matter of regret that my declarations, in 1851, that in ten years on

account of that settlement, we should have either a dissolution of the Union or a civil war, were verified by the event. While Mr. Weed and his friends regarded the death of General Taylor as a loss to their side, I both at that time and ever since looked on it as one of those important events that greatly tended to produce the results which subsequently occurred.

Respectfully, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

During the continuance of the contest, it was obvious that the Southern side was steadily gaining strength. Not only were the extreme measures of the anti-slavery party rejected; but gradually the people of the North were coming to the conclusion that the peace and safety of the whole country would be more secure if a settlement was made, which did substantial justice to both sections. While the body of the Northern members of Congress evidently wished to yield as little as possible, yet there were enough of them combined with the Southern vote to secure the passage of a just measure. In September, however, several Southern gentlemen, who had been standing till then on what was regarded as the Southern side, suddenly changed their attitude, and the so-called compromise of 1850 was adopted. I then, and ever since have felt confident, that if they had stood still a little longer, such was the anxiety of the Northern people for a settlement, that far better terms could have been obtained for the South; such terms in fact as would have produced a permanent peace between the sections.

Some days after the matter had been disposed of, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, a gentleman with whom, on account of his extreme anti-slavery views, I had never been intimate, sat down by my seat and said, "Clingman, I know you are a candid man; tell why it was, that after you all had scared our people in the North so much, that they were willing to give you whatever you asked, that some of you men gave way, and surrendered every thing to us, and got nothing for their own section?" I replied, in substance, that I thought they had made a great mistake and had shown an entire lack of judgment. He answered, "Well, you may depend upon it, that you will never again be able to scare our people; they will say that if after making all this fuss and getting up so much excitement, you were willing to give up everything, and get nothing for your section, that anything else you may attempt is all a sham, and that nothing serious is meant by it." This statement corresponded so well with my own impressions, that his words imprinted themselves strongly on my memory.

The passage of the measures was, however, generally received with satisfaction, and bands of music waited on some of the prominent *Union savers* and heard patriotic speeches.

This session, continuing for ten months, was not only the longest known in the history of the government, but it was also the most interesting and eventful. The House of Representatives was superior in the character of the members composing it, to any I ever knew, and its debates were the ablest, surpassing as a whole those in the Senate at that session.

[A large portion of this speech was devoted to the consideration of the tariff and industrial resources of the Southern States, especially of North Carolina. As the the tariff question is sufficiently discussed in two speeches which follow—the first part of the speech is omitted.]

SPEECH

ON THE FUTURE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT, DELIVERED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 15TH, 1851.

Mr. CLINGMAN said :

* * * * *

“The North has made a great mistake in getting up the late anti-slavery agitation. Instead of endeavoring to limit slavery to the territory where it now exists, if they had consulted their interests, they would have consented to its extension even to the shores of the Pacific. By thus allowing the slaves and their owners to be diffused over a wide extent of country, they would have been kept employed in agriculture, and the competition of their labor would thereby have been escaped, and they would have continued good customers. But by limiting them as to territory, they will be driven, whether they will it or not, into manufacturing for themselves. The conduct of the North, while in my judgment a crime to us, was like Napoleon’s invasion of Spain, a blunder for them. What they intended as an injury, like many other seeming evils, may prove in the end a benefit. So wise and benevolent is the system ordained by Providence, that it usually depends upon ourselves whether a particular occurrence shall in its results be an evil or a blessing. In the language of Burke, “our antagonist is our helper.” The energy which we have summoned to our aid to enable us to resist a threatened danger, will give us strength for a forward movement. A great impulse has been given to the Southern mind within the last twelve months. Much of this is due to the direction, purposely given to the debates of the last session by some of the speakers. While, therefore, I cannot too strongly denounce the acts of the last session in relation to the Mexican territory, I do not, nor have I ever pretended that they would be followed by any great immediate practical injury to us. Undoubtedly depriving us of all share in the public territory, and limiting slavery to the area it now occupies, is the greatest injury, with reference to that interest, which the government could possibly inflict on us, until it shall have attacked the institution in the States themselves.

The other measures proposed by the Abolitionists are comparatively insignificant in their ultimate practical efforts. I do not pretend that this exclusion could be claimed as a political victory by the Free-soil or Abolition party. That party had staked itself on the passage of a positive act of exclusion, viz: the Wilnot Proviso, or Jeffersonian ordinance. After a few weeks discussion it was driven from this ground, being defeated on a direct vote. It then fell back on what was called the Presi-

dent's plan, to-wit: the admission of territories as free States. In this movement, after a long struggle, they were frustrated and foiled by the dilatory motions which the minority resorted to, and which it was seen could and would be indefinitely prolonged. It is true, however, that the measures actually passed, did in the end practically give them the exclusion of slavery which they desired. This, however, was owing to the action of Southern men, who by their votes consented that this section of the Union should be excluded. What I have a right to complain of is, that after the Abolition party stood thus defeated before the country, Southern men should have been willing to give them practically all the fruits of the victory. It is said, however, that the South saved its honor. So did the Mexican army at Monterey. But though it capitulated with the honors of war, it surrendered up the city, the object for which the battle was fought. If we had been overpowered and defeated by this party, I could better have borne their seizing the fruits of the victory. By giving up thus all the Mexican territory to them, in addition to that previously held by the government, and made free by acts of Congress, we have put it in their power to call to their aid, at a future day, twenty or thirty additional free States. If we have found them troublesome now, will they not be more formidable when thus strengthened, should they be roused to another attack? It is this view of the future which has produced the deep dissatisfaction existing in the South. Our people feel that the outposts have been surrendered to our enemies, and that courage and firmness can alone protect them. Even those among us who have defended or apologized for these measures, have tacitly acknowledged the peril to which they subject us, by insisting that the North should be held under the most rigid obligation not to renew the attack. Calling themselves *par excellence* Union men, and stigmatised by their opponents as submissionists, they have nevertheless found it necessary to lay down a strong disunion platform. I say a strong disunion platform; because they have declared their purpose to dissolve the Union upon issues and contingencies which no one, not even the most ultra thought of making a year ago. If the Abolition party encouraged, as it probably will be, by these great acquisitions, shall make another formidable movement against us, it will most probably result in the overthrow of the government, and the disruption of the confederacy. I do not apprehend, however, that they will be able to succeed in abolishing slavery. Two plans are entertained for affecting this object. The first is immediately and directly by legislation to attack it in the States. This mode has not now advocates enough to excite much apprehension in the public mind. The other plan, by which they expect to accomplish the same thing, at a day not far distant in a nation's progress, is the following: They say that the slaves of the country, being confined to the States where they are now held, will so increase in numbers in connection with the multiplication of the white race, that their labor will become unprofitable, not yielding more than enough for their bare subsistence, and that their owners will find it advantageous to abandon them as property, and allow them to go free. They do not stop to calculate how vast will be the misery inflicted by thus crowding together our population. When the pressure has become so great that the labor of the slaves will no longer support them, what will be the

condition of the free laborers under the same rate of wages? To carry out their fanatical and wicked objects they are perfectly willing to place the whole Southern country in a condition of indescribable misery.

The Northern anti-slavery men express the desire that they should then be amalgamated with the white race. The Southern men who maintain this hypothesis, are desirous of colonizing them abroad. As nobody pretends that we are able to send off the numbers we now have, I do not think it worth while to enter into an argument to show that when greatly increased in numbers, they cannot be thus gotten away with more facility. However benevolent the scheme, I have never regarded it as sufficiently plausible to merit attack. But when is it likely that the liberation itself in this mode will occur? A distinguished statesman whose declarations have great weight with many of our citizens, is represented in the newspapers recently, to have expressed the opinion at a meeting, held in this city, that when the number of slaves in the United States shall have become three or four times as great as it now is, that the contingency will happen, and that they will become free by the voluntary act of their owners. As the slaves have been doubling their numbers, in a little more than twenty-five years, that condition of things might be expected to be arrived at in the next fifty years. In that time the population of the slaveholding States might amount to nearly forty millions, of which, nearly one-third would be slaves. Those States embrace together an area of nearly nine hundred thousand square miles. A population of forty millions diffused over them, need not be more dense than that of Kentucky now is. It might go up to more than fifty millions, before it became as dense as that of the State of Maryland. In these States, slave labor is not so unprofitable that its owners are willing voluntarily to give it up, or even to take the high prices which it commands further South. Yet these States are not supposed to be remarkably adapted to the profitable use of slave labor—nor are they as a whole, above the average fertility of the slave holding States. No only, too, are they able, permanently to maintain their present population, but nobody, I think, doubts but what it might be greatly increased, without a material change in their condition or prosperity. Is there any reason to apprehend that the Southern States are incapable, as a whole, of sustaining a population proportionally as great, or even much greater? It is the opinion of a friend of mine, on the other side of the House, from Mississippi [Mr. Thompson] that in a single bend in the river of the same name, there is a body of land yet untouched, sufficiently extensive and fertile to employ profitably in the culture of cotton, all the slaves now existing in the State of Virginia. That our population would, in time, become too dense for a comfortable existence, I do not question. But the period must be longer, than that supposed. Before that time has arrived, possibly the slaves may, in the opinion of some, disappear in another mode.

But does any man imagine that we shall not acquire additional territory in much less than fifty years. Why, Mexico even now seems to be on the eye of falling to pieces. I should not be surprised, at any time, to hear that the adventurous gold hunters now in California, had organized an expedition and seized upon the Mexican provinces immediately south of them. When Texas is filled up by our emigrants they cannot

be prevented from passing the Rio Grande and revolutionizing the neighboring provinces. They are destined to be occupied by our slaveholding population. It will fill up all the country around the gulf, including the peninsula of Yucatan, and perhaps the northern portion of the South American continent. This state of things will be likely to occur even before our interest requires it. That whether it be desirable or not, there is no power on this continent to prevent it. Mexico is altogether too feeble. This government itself cannot do it. It had as well attempt to curb the waves of the ocean. I say boldly, that if the government makes the effort, it will itself perish in the attempt. As soon as we feel the actual want of additional territory, we shall occupy it either with or without the aid of this government. Our right to take it will be neither better nor worse than that by which we have driven back the original Indian population. Even now, we are strong enough to take care of ourselves against any forces that can be brought to bear upon us, and we shall be getting relatively stronger for some time to come. Sir, the returns of the census for the past year will present a condition of things not anticipated by many persons. Within the last ten years, some two millions of foreigners have arrived in this country. They have almost all become residents of the Northern States. They, of themselves, were sufficient to have given the North more than twenty additional members of Congress under the new apportionment. But, in point of fact, if you except the two members she gets by the admission of California, she will gain nothing, or at most, but two or three members. Notwithstanding, therefore, this great advantage, as well as others which the North has had, the South will nevertheless very nearly, if not quite, hold her relative strength. This is due to the fact that our people, being mostly agriculturists, enjoy more of the comforts of life, and are increasing in numbers faster from natural causes. The condition of society at the North is less favorable to this progress because of the numbers engaged in manufacturing, and as servants to the wealthy, who are without domicils, and who are frequently reduced to pauperism.

The next decade will show a large increase in our Southern population. We are now nearly ten millions, and there is no body of people of the same number upon earth, better able to defend itself against attack. Slavery, instead of being an element of weakness, is one of positive strength. The amount of force which any nation can keep in the field in time of war, depends not merely on the number of its men, but also on the amount of its production. Few countries, if any, can sustain permanently in the field, more than one-sixth of their adult male population. We have a population intelligent, enterprising, high-spirited, and brave, and ever ready to embark in military expeditions.

It is due to truth to state, that from the formation of the government down to the present time, in all our wars, the South has, in proportion to its population, sent into the field a larger number of soldiers than the North. Nor have those men in battle, either where the snows of Canada lie, or under the tropical sun of Mexico, exhibited any such want of courage or conduct, as to justify this government in branding them as inferior to the men of the Northern section, or in depriving them of their proper share of the benefits of the Constitution.

Our population is large enough to supply any call that could be made on it for soldiers, and still leave at home a sufficient number for industrial occupations. We must have nearly one million of free men capable of bearing arms. Our slave population, too, because it is all constantly employed in labor, produces probably more than the same number of free men in any part of the Union, because a large portion of the free are unemployed during much, if not the whole of their time. No sane man can imagine that we need have serious fears of an attack from either the Northern States or any foreign power. When our numbers are swelled to thirty or fifty millions, will we be relatively less able? Sir, we shall have the power to take possession, and hold as much of the American continent as is necessary for our comfortable existence. If this government shall take position against our progress, it will be overthrown. Great as are its powers, they are not sufficient to enable it thus to destroy us. Whether it shall continue to exist or not, he who lives longest among us will see the Southern States—

“Still free and beautiful, and far
Aloof from desolation.”

But this government was created to wage no such war against us. It was made by the States for their protection, and that of their existing institutions. They intended to invest it with no powers to destroy their existing state of society or to foment revolutions among their inhabitants. Should it, by abandoning its original purposes, be instigated to such attempts by any process, whether sudden or slow, then I say down with the government. One of my strongest grounds of objection to the action of the last session was, that I regarded it as a great disunion movement. There is reason to fear that the additional strength given the free States may at a future day embolden them to make an attempt upon us which will result in the overthrow of the government. It is apprehension of this which painfully affects the minds of the Southern people. They are apprehensive of injury from no government upon earth, except their own, which should be their protector. The action here has filled their minds with alarm. If any one could satisfy them that they would receive no injury from this quarter, he would diffuse general joy among them.

One great benefit, Mr. Chairman, has resulted from the late slavery agitation. Heretofore our people had been accustomed to think of the Union with a sort of religious reverence. They were disposed to idolize the work of their own hands. But all superstitions are degrading and debasing in their effects. I rejoice that our people have been liberated from its influences. The agitation here, and the discussions attendant on it, have produced a great revolution in the sentiments of our population. They had been accustomed to rest in thought on the idea of the Union as the ark of safety, but they have been aroused from the delusion. One of our citizens, Mr. Stevens, while travelling in Central America, experienced there the shock of a violent earthquake. He declared that it had produced a great permanent revolution in his feelings, in one respect. Till then he said, he had been accustomed, when upon the surface of the earth, to feel secure, and that he rested on a

foundation firm and stable. But ever afterwards, he could only think of the solid globe itself as a frail tremulous thing, ready to give way under him at any moment. The shock of an earthquake has passed under the minds of our people, and they no longer rest on the Union as the solid rock of safety. I rejoice that it is so. I wish to see them bold, self-relying and confident of being able with the favor of Providence to guard their liberties, and preserve their happiness. It will be long before confidence, that "plant of slow growth," will flourish again. Rather let them realize the great truth, that "eternal vigilance," is the price of liberty. They have met too with its merited scorn, and trampled under their feet the doctrine of slavish subserviency to the government of their own creation. Certain professed national organs and orators have preached devotion to the Union in any event, and under all circumstances. A baser sentiment never fell from the lips of a mortal. It is substantially the same with the doctrine of passive obedience, and non-resistance, which brought the head of Charles the First to the block. Since then no Englishman has had the effrontery to avow such opinions. Its only supporters in this country formerly were the tories of the revolution. Those who have preached the doctrine in our day, will only find their fellows among the palace slaves of Asiatic despotism. Their proper position is below everything that Providence has created, when in its natural state. Even the meanest reptiles struggle upward against the oppressor. The American people justly regard these individuals as degraded below the rest of animated nature.

While the government lasts, it is our duty to endeavor to keep it in the proper track. The danger is not from violence. The sword has ever been a great destroyer. It has consumed feeble communities and States. But taxation has been the destroyer of the mighty. By government exaction in its different forms, great nations have perished. The decay of the Roman empire has been attributed by the abolition writers of England, as by their echoes in this country to slavery. But the facts and reasonings of abolitionists, are alike destitute of truth. Slavery existed in Rome from the days of Romulus. During the prosperous ages of the republic, the full tide of conquest enabled them to make the largest number of captives. The servile population greatly outnumbered the free. These were the days of the highest prosperity of the eternal city. During the decaying years of the empire, the number of slaves was rather diminished. But government taxation in its various forms, exhibited a frightful increase. The exactions of the governors ruined the remote provinces, or drove them into successful rebellion. Italy was then drained of its life-blood to support the populace, which concentrated itself at Rome to receive the largesses of the government. In this way died the vast Roman empire. A similar condition of things is now being presented to our own eyes in Turkey. The exactions of the government have destroyed its vitality. The population is concentrating at Constantinople, the point of government expenditure. The most fertile lands of Asia Minor and Turkey, in Europe, are rapidly becoming a desert waste; and the magnificent Ottoman empire is now little better than a dead carcass. In this way perished the old empires, which formerly existed on the banks of the Euphrates. The extended ruins only indicate to the passing traveler over the desert, how destructive have

been the exactions of those who have held dominion over the country. Where there is no security, where no limit exists to the rapacity of the governors, there can be no inducement to the subject to labor or to save.

What is now going on in British India exemplifies the process. Forty-five per cent., nearly one-half of the gross product is now exacted from the agriculturists, in many if not all the districts. Can that country live permanently under the system? Ireland is oppressed by similar exactions. A prosperous country like Cuba or the United States can bear a great deal. With us the direct taxation has not heretofore been great, but of the indirect there has been reason to complain. Permit me to take from an individual as much as I choose of all his purchases, and I may inflict upon him heavy oppression. The Southern States of the Union are sending from their limits not less than one hundred and fifty million of dollars worth of their domestic productions, and they receive or should receive an equal value in return for them. But the government takes from them as much as it pleases. They may, it is true, escape this burthen, by manufacturing for themselves everything they consume. But if the anti-slavery party should get the entire control of the government, as they are laboring to do, and have a prospect of accomplishing, when they shall have brought in a sufficient number of free States, may at their will make the Constitution, possibly in form, certainly in practice, what they desire it to be. As our system of society is radically different from theirs, they might so shape their legislation as to isolate us and take away our substance entirely, and have the Southern States little better than a dead body, fastened to a living one. This condition of things is what we have most to dread. Already is it apprehended by sagacious men, that the character and action of this central government is undergoing a total change. Sir, what was the object of its creation, and with what attributes was it originally invested? It was created to effect two main objects. In the first place to manage our relations with foreign countries. Hence it became necessary to invest it with the power of making war, treaties, and regulating commerce with them. In the second place it was authorized to preserve proper relations between the different States, and by consequence to regulate commerce between them and coin their money.

These were the main, I might say the sole objects of the creation of the Constitution. To carry them into effect, it was necessary that the government should have the means of sustaining itself, and hence the taxing power was given. But it was never intended that the federal government should control the mere municipal relations of its citizens or interfere with their private rights. These were left to be regulated by the several States composing the Union. Had the government confined itself to the exercise of these two classes of powers which alone were clearly delegated to it, it would have escaped most of the difficulty which it has hitherto encountered. Especially ought it to have abstained from attacking interests which it was created to preserve. It has encountered difficulties by its officious intermeddling with what it had no positive authority to touch. For example, its interference with the question of slavery has very nearly been the cause of its destruction. Twelve of the thirteen States which made the Constitution were slaveholding, and while they gave it express power to defend and preserve the institution

of slavery, they invested it with no authority to overthrow or even to make war on it. The government, too, has involved itself in difficulty by its attempts, through the medium of tariff and navigation laws, to favor certain classes of its citizens by the imposition of burthens upon others. It has also produced much discontent by its interference and connection with banking operations and other branches of private business. Nobody will dispute but what it might have abstained from all these things and still carried out every object which it was created to effect. Yes, sir, it might abandon all these pretensions, and accomplish only the better the great purposes of its existence. Why then should it not be limited in its action to its own proper sphere? In this way it might give itself a perpetual and indefinite existence.

Our citizens are ambitious of having a widely extended and magnificent empire. The wish of their hearts might possibly be gratified, and the whole continent be subject to one sway, if this central government should, in its action, be limited to its necessary and proper objects. Let it content itself with conducting successfully our foreign affairs, and preserving the relations between its component States, leaving them to regulate all domestic matters. Let it be, as many desire it to be, the great central sun; but let it be content with performing the office, which the sun does in the firmament of the heavens. That vast luminary regulates the orbits of the planets, preserves their due dependence on each other, and controls their motions, but itself remains at rest in the centre. Does any one regard its office as less important, because of its quiet, controlling as it does the action of the entire system, and preserving the due dependence of all its parts? Or does any one suppose that it could assume the rapid motions of the little planet Mercury, without deranging and destroying the whole solar system? So if this central government shall attempt to assume the active and lesser functions, which properly belong to the several States, it will destroy the existing system. It may possibly create in its stead a vast and extended despotism. I rather hope, however, that the attempts would be followed by the disruption of the government, and the throwing off of several confederacies. The fragments thus separated, would be sufficiently large to preserve their liberties, and advance the sum of human happiness. Is not the apprehension even now constantly expressed, that the government is totally changing its limited character, and becoming a useless and mischievous machine? Why, members on this floor often pay no more regard to constitutional limitations, than they would do in a popular meeting, where the unchecked will of the majority controls all things.

Many of our people are beginning to suppose this government derelict in its duties, if it does not supply them regularly with school books and garden seeds. Look at the enormous increase in its expenditures. They are now amounting to more than fifty millions annually. I do not intend to cast reproach on the President or his advisers, constituting the cabinet. I respect them all highly, and regard them as well qualified, both intellectually and morally, for the stations which they fill. The estimates for expenditure, which they send in to us, will be almost assuredly increased in this House. After passing through this body, they will have vast additions made to them in the Senate. On the last day, or next to the last of the session, they will be returned to us with a hun-

dred or two hundred amendments, amounting in the aggregate to an expenditure of millions. For want of time to investigate them, or to save the general appropriation bills from defeat, because the Senate is obstinate on the last day of the session, we are obliged to assent to appropriations, which would not in this House, after a proper investigation, find supporters enough to obtain a division on the vote rejecting them. From the very situation in which we find ourselves placed here, it is impossible that there should be that feeling of responsibility, and that degree of vigilance which exists in our State legislatures. The several States ought to leave to individuals the accomplishment of all such works as private enterprize can effect, because of the greater cheapness of its operations. For a similar reason we ought to leave to the States the execution of whatever can be accomplished by them. I know that for the evil under which we labor, it is difficult to find a remedy, but an honest effort on the part of all of us concerned in the administration of this federal government, would be productive of much good. The clamor raised against Mr. Van Buren's administration for its extravagance, caused a reduction of its expenditures in its last year, from forty down to twenty-two millions. During the whole four years of the administration of Mr. Tyler, the Whig party having come into power upon professions and principles of economy, kept their expenditures down to this standard. During the first year of Mr. Polk's administration, the expenses were not materially increased. But now, an interval of only five years having elapsed, they are greatly more than doubled. Still there is much reason to fear that they will be rapidly increased. This results from the fact that while the people furnish the money, the government determines the amount of the expenditure.

Where an individual is responsible for his own expenses, it is often difficult for him to keep his outlay within proper limits. But wherever one furnishes the money and another expends it, profusion and extravagance almost invariably are the results. Had we not then better refuse all expenditures, and decline to exercise all powers but those which are necessary to the carrying out of the known and well defined objects of this government? The case is surrounded with difficulty, however, because it is easy to carry into excess and abuse powers, the exercise of which cannot well be dispensed with. I have sometimes thought, Mr. Chairman, that a striking difference between the modes of thinking in the southern and northern portions of our Union, might be found in this: The people of the Southern States engaged in agriculture live far apart, are accustomed to reflect much, and are not easily driven to excess. In the North, the people are in close contact, more restless in their habits, more readily act upon each other, they show more quickness and energy in their movements, and manifest more excitability. They are more readily brought up to efficient action, but reflect less on the ultimate tendency of their movements. The excitable population and presses of their large cities, as sensitive to the change of a day as the thermometer itself, exert a controlling influence over the sentiment of the North. Hence the Northern population, acting as States and corporations, have shown great efficiency, and made extraordinary progress. They have not, however, exhibited so much of that enlarged philosophy, which is essential to the constitution of a statesman of the first order. Their public men

are usually too sensitive to popular impulse, and exhibit often too little independence of thought and action. The Southern States seem to have produced a larger number of independent, self-relying and philosophic statesmen. In the action of bodies of men aggregated as States and corporations, this spirit of great activity and energy works well, and the Northern States have made extraordinary progress in their movements.

In the Southern States, on the contrary, the individuals live more alone, are accustomed to depend more on their own resources, have a feeling of greater independence, and have more time for reflection. They are less sensitive to immediate popular impressions, exhibit often a stronger will as individuals, and are more accustomed to take an enlarged and philosophic view of a subject. This, as it has sometimes been alleged by the Abolitionists, may be due in part to the habit of dominion over their slaves and the pride of superior caste. But whether attributable in any degree or not to such a cause, it is certainly true that while they have accomplished less, through the medium of the State governments wherein mere activity and impulse are more essential, they seem to have exerted a greater control upon the action of this central government. It is a common remark throughout the North, that certain systems and movements which are complained of with us, really had their origin with Southern statesmen. This is undoubtedly true. The Virginians were opposed to the indefinite importation of slaves, and advocated the prohibition to take effect after the year 1808, and Mr. Jefferson undoubtedly favored the exclusion of slavery north of the Ohio river. But when the New England politicians, that in the Convention which made the Federal Constitution, went for the prolongation of the slave trade to the latest period proposed, subsequently shifted their position and assumed the strongest anti-slavery ground in the Missouri controversy, it is equally certain that Mr. Jefferson condemned their movement. It is also true that the doctrine of protection to our domestic industry, had its early and most strenuous advocates among Southern statesmen. As soon, however, as it was taken up by the masses of the North, it was pressed to an extent of extravagant protection and even prohibition. The doctrine of internal improvement by the general government, is likewise affirmed to have had a Southern origin. But its Northern friends are now those who are pushing it into great abuses, as we think, accompanied with profuse and wasteful expenditure. As the action of this government, therefore, was intended to be limited in a high degree, and restricted to the exercise of well defined powers, the prevalent mode of thinking at the South, seems to harmonise best with its nature, and it may be owing to some such cause as this that the public judgment has more frequently intrusted its management to them. It is possible too, that the great influx of foreigners into the Northern States, ignorant as they are utterly of the true theory of our government, and its complicated checks and balances, has been a material element in modifying the tone of opinion and sentiment in the North.

Should the action of the government in future be directed by those who are subject to these influences, it remains to be seen whether it will preserve its former character and usefulness. The agitation of the last two years having partially destroyed the old party organizations, and having very nearly annihilated party animosities, in the present calm an

opportunity is afforded us for examining the principles of the government, and estimating properly the effects of its past action. Should new parties arise or the old ones be essentially modified, they ought to be made to stand as much as possible upon sound principles. What are likely to be the successful movements of a party character, it is not easy to decide. We were all amused yesterday with the attempts of the gentleman from Maryland, (Mr. McLane) in reply to the questions of the gentleman from South Carolina, to explain in what Democracy consisted. His definition was that a Democrat was he who stood by and honestly carried out the objects and determinations of the party organization. This definition he twice gave in reply to questions.

Mr. McLane said this was not his statement, and proposed to explain.

Mr. Clingman continued.

I regret that the hands of the clock are moving too rapidly, to permit me to give the gentleman the floor. I may be mistaken about the precise terms he did use. The members of the House generally are quite as likely to recollect what he did say, as he or I. He said further, in continuation, that a Democrat in 1848 was he that voted for Cass and Butler, and in 1844 for Polk and Dallas. Amusing as was the exhibition made by the gentleman on that occasion, I doubt whether any other member of the House would not have found it as difficult to define the distinctions between Whigs and Democrats, as national parties, at this time. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the old issues, which formerly divided these two parties, have now disappeared, and for want of the old landmarks, the lines of division are scarcely perceptible. (Mr. McLane said, that they still existed in his opinion.)

Then, sir, it is very extraordinary that the gentleman on yesterday was not able to point them out. Though cross-examined by several members, and worried for a quarter of an hour, he was not able to lay hold of any one of these old landmarks. They must have been buried very deeply under ground to escape detection by optics as keen as his. There can be no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the Whig and Democratic parties, once essentially divided as to measures, have now become mere factions. By factions, I mean as contra-distinguished from parties, to designate bodies of men, not separated by well-defined principles, but only by political animosity, or because struggling against each other for office. Such associations are usually the most mischievous. Wanting the disinterestedness and purity, which a struggle for principle is apt to engender, they soon become utterly selfish, and tend to political corruption. I have no objection, therefore, to see new party combinations formed, as the government of the country is likely thereby to be in a better rather than in a worse position. Though I did not co-operate in the late attempt to form the so-called Union party, yet I had no objection to the movement. I saw at once that a party could not stand upon a single mere negative idea, and that before it could progress it would have to adopt positive principles to regulate its general action. If those principles, when promulgated, had, contrary to my anticipations, accorded with my views of what is sound policy, better than the principles of the antagonist party, then I should not have hesitated to co-operate with them. I say now, Mr. Chairman, that if the old Republican party of the days of Jefferson and Madison, that party which was broken to

pieces in 1825, by reason of its having nominally five presidential candidates in the field—if that party could be called together, upon its old principles, I would rather march under its flag than that of any other likely to be found. I know that its name has sometimes been brought into disrepute, because many professing the name have, in practice, apostatized from its principles, while others have incurred ridicule by their misapplication of those principles. True religion has been brought into disrepute by the hypocrisy of its professors, and good coin is sometimes discredited by counterfeits.

The principles of this old party, regardful of the rights of the States, strictly defining the powers of the Federal government, and limiting as much as possible the lines of its action, are those only on which our system can permanently stand. In the part of the Union from which I come, the great body of men of all classes, have originally belonged to or professed the principles of that party. Many even of the old federalists having seen the mischief of a different line of policy would be ready to embrace its principles. As for myself, sir, I shall at all times be ready to sustain whatever measures sound policy, and the permanent interests of the country shall in my judgment require, without regard to the parties or individuals with whom I may for the time be placed. A public man here can find no compensation for his surrender of the right of private judgment, and independence of action on all practical issues of moment. In conclusion, I have to say that I think the present revenue system ought to be reviewed, and modified in some respects. The frauds in the collection of duties complained of should be remedied as far as practicable; but those who are making most clamor are doing it with a view of deceiving the country, as to their real object, which is to foist on it a tariff enormously high. I am ready myself now to vote for a specific duty on bar iron, for example, but I will not vote as the gentleman from Ohio proposed last session, to make it \$20 per ton, or even to increase it generally. Everybody knows that the higher the rate of duty the greater the temptation to evade it by fraudulent devices. If there were time, which there is not, at the present session, I should be willing to review the whole system. Some of the duties are too high. Others possibly ought to be increased. The mode of assessing many of them ought unquestionably to be changed. While I would be willing for the sake of revenue to see an imposition on everything that is imported, I say now, that if any one article ought to be made absolutely free of duty, I know none having stronger claims to the exemption than railroad iron.

The navigation laws too need essential modification. Why should not the agriculturist, when he has conveyed his produce to the sea-side, not have the privilege of sending it off in the vessel that will carry it cheapest. By extending the reciprocity system lately adopted with Great Britain, (but limited to the foreign commerce) to the coast-wise trade the enormous rates of freight between our Southern and Northern ports would be greatly reduced. Our farmers and citizens generally, would be gainers thereby. Nor do I think that our shipping interests would materially suffer. The adoption of the reciprocity system in the foreign trade has not injured us at all. Its extension with proper qualifications ought not to be objected to. Our ship owners would doubtless sustain themselves, though their freight would be less than under the

present monopoly. Let the question of Canadian reciprocity and the free navigation of the St. Lawrence be considered, in connection with these things. They are perhaps right in themselves, but I should prefer that the system should be re-examined as a whole at the same time.

With reference to the bill now under consideration, I have little to say. The strongest objection to the system of internal improvement is its liability to gross abuse, by reason of its partial tendencies, as well as the dishonest political combinations to which it is apt to give rise. For some of the items in this bill I can readily vote. The Mississippi river is a proper subject for expenditure. So is the opening of the inlet to Albemarle sound, which my colleague [Mr. Outlaw] has so much at heart. The same may doubtless be said as to some of the other appropriations for works on the sea coasts and on the lakes. My vote, therefore, on this bill, will be guided by the precise form it may ultimately assume; but the inclination of my mind is strongly against the system. I doubt whether it will not always be so managed as to be productive of mischief rather than benefits.

NOTE.

After the compromise measures of the preceding session, there had been some excitement in respect to them. Mr. Seward, and such men as shared his views, attempted to create a feeling against them in the North, but with little success, as it was evident that on the great territorial issue, the Northern States had nothing to complain of. Over the amendment to the Fugitive Slave Law, the abolitionists raised a clamour, and committed some violations of the law, but no considerable opposition could be created to the system of measures as a whole.

Their friends attempted to avail themselves of the general satisfaction in the country on account of a settlement having been made, to form a new party, called an "Union Party." Resolutions were presented in the House endorsing the measures, and condemning agitation against them, &c. A paper was also prepared and signed by many gentlemen, proposing the formation of the new party.

The very foundation on which that party was to rest, and the character of those who would have led it, made it evident that it would be a party of centralization, consolidation, regardless of all constitutional limitations, and a mere organization to promote monopolies, public plunder through tariffs, wasteful expenditures, and the oppression of the agricultural interests of the country. I hoped, however, that the movement might become strong enough to destroy the two existing organizations, so that the party opposed to this movement, which I felt confident could be made the strongest, might adopt the name of the old Jeffersonian Republican party, and by planting itself firmly on its principles govern the country in accordance with the Constitution.

My efforts, in private conversation, to induce the Democrats to adopt the name of "Democratic Republican" party, met with much favor with many Southern members, but those from the North said that the term "Democrat" was so attractive to the foreigners, especially the Germans, that the change would be more likely to weaken, than strengthen the party. Had the change then been made our adversaries would not afterwards, as they did, have been able to avail themselves of the

popular name of "Republican," for their anti-slavery organization, thus verifying Jefferson's prediction.

It seemed then clear to my mind that the old Whig party had already received a wound which would prove mortal. The facts sustaining this view will be more appropriately presented, when we are considering the incidents of the Presidential campaign of the year 1852.

To encourage public men to stand firmly by their convictions, this circumstance may properly be mentioned. In the Presidential contest of 1848, my Congressional District had with my concurrence given General Taylor three fourths of the votes cast, and I had been elected to the first Congress of his administration without opposition. And yet, though I opposed the leading measures of his administration, and though the compromise measures had at first been received with almost universal approval, and though I had in the next canvass, an able and eloquent opponent, nevertheless, I was re-elected by a majority relatively nearly as large as General Taylor's had been. This would scarcely have occurred if I had not always offered myself as an independent candidate, and tends to show that where one announces that he will be governed in his action by the convictions of his judgment, and appeals directly to the people, they will in a proper case sustain him. On the other hand a man selected by a party convention, would be rejected next time by the political managers, or repudiated by the voters who had originally elected him.

SPEECH

ON DUTIES ON RAILROAD IRON AND COMMERCIAL RESTRICTIONS,
DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
AUGUST 21, 1852.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I avail myself of this occasion to say something with reference to the subject of the duties on railroad iron. The bill for the relief of the Raleigh and Gaston Railroad has just been defeated by a vote of the House. As that measure was under the operation of the previous question originally, and as the motion to lay on the table the question of reconsideration was not debatable, I was precluded from saying any thing in its favor. Though it has been thus rejected, there is still a bill pending for the repeal of the duties on all railroad iron, which, if passed, would be more advantageous even to that road than would have been the bill just defeated. I am the more desirous of offering some observations to the committee, because of the course of the friends of higher duties, as we have witnessed it again and again during the present session. We have seen several attempts to put in the appropriation bills, clauses increasing largely the present taxes, for the sake of protection. These motions have been made, too, after the debate was stopped, and at a time when no discussion could be had in the committee. They are thus endeavoring clandestinely to foist on the country a much higher tariff than the people would know-

ingly submit to. This mode of proceeding is by no means creditable to the cause. In former times, having doubtless confidence in the soundness of the system, the friends of high duties introduced their tariff bills in the usual mode of legislation, so as to permit a fair discussion and investigation as to the merits of the measure. Of late the contrary practice has been adopted, and it is fair to presume that gentlemen have despaired of success in a fair contest, and are endeavoring, by some device or sudden stratagem, to get some oppressive act fastened on the country. As we are given to understand that, in despite of the late failures, a new attempt is yet to be made to get in a clause of the kind to some one of the unfinished appropriation bills, I avail myself of this, the only occasion, to expose such a system of tactics.

When at an earlier period of the session the bill for the benefit of the Raleigh and Gaston Railroad was under consideration, there was the best prospect for its passage, the majority for it being large on all the preliminary votes. To-day, however, it has been finally defeated. Why this change? Because of an adverse influence which has been brought actively into the field. There is a certain iron interest in the country—a sort of fourth department of the government—which claims the right to control our legislation. Not content with their representation on this floor, they send regularly, at each session, bodies of delegates who fill our lobbies, with a view of influencing our action. They are often too successful in misleading such members as have not thoroughly examined the subject, and compared their contradictory and conflicting statements from year to year. When they find that their statement of facts does not answer the purpose, but can be successfully used against them, they are in the habit of shifting it, and coming up with a new one of a contradictory character. It is only, therefore, by comparing these different statements, through a series of years, that we can hope to understand the true state of the case.

Seeing, during the earlier part of the session, that there was a prospect of the country being relieved from an unnecessary tax on railroad iron, they have sent on an unusually strong representation. Having for a great many years, been accustomed to have taxes imposed on the rest of the community for their benefit, they have at length grown so insolent as to insist, not only that these taxes shall be paid perpetually, whether the government needs the money or not, but that they shall be paid in cash, without one moment's delay.

For example, this Raleigh and Gaston Company having purchased in England iron to lay down on their road, are obliged by the existing tariff law, to pay to the government \$70,000 or \$80,000 as a duty or tax, before they are allowed to bring their iron into the country. Being pressed in their means, they asked that, instead of a payment in cash, they should be permitted to give bonds, with good security, to pay this duty in one, two, three, and four years. They also proposed that the government should retain the money which it is to pay them for carrying the mail on their road. This would be sufficient, too, to pay off the debt as it falls due.

It is also admitted that the government does not need the money, as there will be, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, a surplus at the close of the present fiscal year, of about \$20,000,000. In this state of facts, though the government will in nowise be injured by granting the indulgence, we find these iron representatives making a most strenuous resistance, which in the end is successful in defeating the bill. They do not pretend either that they could have furnished, on any reasonable terms, iron to this company. On the contrary, it has been expressly admitted by Representatives from Pennsylvania on this floor, that in that State the railroads going up to their own works, were laid down with foreign iron. They themselves, when making roads, find it cheaper to purchase iron in England, pay the expense of getting it home, and the duty of thirty per cent. on its value, rather than use their own domestic iron. They have, nevertheless, on the present occasion, been instrumental in defeating by a bare majority of one vote, this bill for the temporary relief of one of our companies, in which the State of North Carolina is interested, to the extent of one-half.

Part of their opposition is doubtless due to the circumstance adverted to sometime since in debate, by the gentleman from Vermont, (Mr. Meacham) who denounced the last Legislature of North Carolina, because it had passed, by a unanimous vote, resolutions against any additional protection to the manufacturing and mining interests of the North. Under the influence of this feeling, in part, but mainly because members have been misled by the statements of this Pennsylvania iron delegation, the bill I refer to has been defeated, and opposition strengthened against a repeal of the duties on railroad iron. Had gentlemen been more familiar with the subject, no such effect could have been produced.

Mr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, (interrupting.) All I have to say is, that so far from operating against these railroad bills, that delegation of which the gentleman speaks, unfortunately, and by what I deem an unwise contract, passed through this House, or made its friends pass, a bill giving 3,000,000 acres of land to the Missouri railroad; and without the aid of those outsiders, it had no chance.

Mr. Clingman, (resuming.) It is very likely, Mr. Chairman, that that delegation did succeed in passing the Missouri railroad bill; but it was a mere mistake which they made.

Their object was, by an improper bargain, to get the votes of Western men to impose fresh taxes on the country for the benefit of the iron interest, and they no doubt pushed through the Missouri bill expecting to get a return. They did not get it, however, and I am glad they did fail. I trust, sir, that all such attempts will bring nothing but disappointment and mortification on the actors. When there is any combination to plunder the public, I hope that the parties to it will always fail to obtain any benefit, and that the Western members will stand out all the time against the bids of this interest. It is notorious to all of us who have been here for the last three years, that this iron interest is constantly offering support to Western measures, upon con-

dition that the Representatives from that section will join them in imposing additional taxes on the community.

Before, however, Mr. Chairman, speaking directly to this question of the duties on railroad iron, I wish to notice some of the general positions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Stevens) and the gentleman from Vermont, (Mr. Meacham.) I attempted at the time when their speeches were delivered to reply to each of them, but was not so fortunate in the general struggle as to obtain the floor. There was one striking difference in the style of argumentation of the two gentlemen. The gentleman from Vermont indulged in some statements of facts, and gave us arrays of figures. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania, being an old soldier in the cause, was too sagacious to venture on such ground. He knows that facts are stubborn things, that will not get out of anybody's way, and that figures, when fairly used, often prove too much. He has seen how, at former sessions, the array of facts and figures, presented by the iron conventions, were successfully used against their views. He has therefore avoided making specific points, and contented himself with certain generalities and stereotyped arguments in favor of protection and encouragement to American labor, &c. The gentleman has no doubt made many a good stump speech in Lancaster with these materials. Everybody is in *favor of protection*, but who is fond of *taxation*? Is what the gentleman asks simply protection, or is it taxation, and unnecessary taxation at that? This is the point to be settled. One of the positions taken by the gentleman from Vermont, will enable us to illustrate this point clearly. That gentleman insisted that in consequence of the reduction of the duties by the present tariff, below what they were under the act of 1842, the North had been a great loser. He argued that it had lost much more than the South, by reason of the escape of its fugitive slaves. He insisted, with the utmost vehemence, that Southern men were very inconsistent in demanding a law for the return of fugitive slaves, and yet not agreeing to give additional duties to the manufacturers. It is, sir, undoubtedly true that Southern men have lost slaves to a considerable extent, by reason of their escape into the free States.

But how is it with Northern property? Have any of the manufacturing establishments been destroyed or seized by anybody? Or have the fabrics made by them been taken away? This is not pretended, and even if it were likely to be done, the whole military force of the country would at once be called out to protect them. It must be admitted by everybody that they are fully and thoroughly protected. What is it, then really, that the gentleman asked? Why, that we shall impose high duties or taxes on all who bring in foreign fabrics to sell, so that the manufacturers may get higher prices for what they make than is fair, according to the market prices of the world. This is really what he asks. To make the cases parallel, therefore, suppose that Congress had passed a fugitive slave law so efficient that not a single slave was ever lost, and that then I should make a loud complaint here, and insist that our slave property needed protection, and when called upon to explain, should say that I wished Congress to

pass a law imposing a tax of fifty per cent. or more on the sale of all productions made by free labor, so that we might thus get a higher price for what the slaves made. This would be exactly such a case as the gentleman makes. And if Congress should agree to impose a tax of thirty per cent. on the productions of free labor to gratify my importunity, and enable slave-holders to make larger profits, I might still complain just as he does, and say, that because they did not impose a duty of fifty per cent., we had lost the difference between that sum and thirty per cent. This comparison, I think illustrates the real position of the gentleman. He has, as far as the manufacturing interest is concerned, no better ground of complaint than an individual would have, to whom we last year voted a pension of \$2,000, if we should now give him but \$1,000. He might with as much reason complain that we had injured him to the extent of \$1,000, because we did not again give him twice that sum. But if the gentleman really considers the present duty of thirty per cent. on railroad iron injurious, I am willing to take it off.

Again, Mr. Chairman, to make the case clearer, if possible, it is sometimes said in Congress, and more frequently in stump speeches, that the tariff is only a fence which Brother Jonathan has made to keep John Bull from injuring his property. It is certainly necessary in our country to the success of farming operations, that the crops should be protected by fences. But suppose, sir, that a man whose field was already surrounded by a good fence, should insist on having a law passed that no person should be allowed to sell corn, without paying a tax of fifty cents on each bushel, unless that corn had been made in his field. If he could get such a law passed, it might undoubtedly enable him to get fifty cents more for each bushel of his corn than the market price would otherwise enable him to do, and would of course make it that much worse on all corn buyers; but would it not seem strange if the community were told that this law was a mere fence to protect his crop from damage? It is idle for gentlemen to say that the duties do not increase the price, and are not intended to do so. If they lowered the market value of the articles, the manufacturers would be injured by getting less for what they make. This nobody pretends; on the contrary, they can only be profited by the enhancement of prices.

To prevent misconception, I declare, sir, that I am willing, and I believe the community are willing, to bear all the taxation that is really necessary to sustain the government. The country has also consented that during the infancy of our manufactures they should be highly protected. From the war of 1812, a period of forty years, these infants have been well protected, and are even now enjoying the advantage of thirty per cent. duties. Being now forty years of age, can they not do with less? Why, our present tariff would be regarded as a very high one in any country in Europe. Not long since the new British minister, Lord Derby, a high protectionist, said in debate, that the British Parliament ought to follow the example of the United States, and adopt a high tariff like ours. Their duties, it is well known, since the reduction made five years ago, are not generally higher than

ten per cent. As, however, a majority of the members of Parliament are on this question known to be opposed to the Minister, and in fact for free trade, there is no probability of their going back to the old system of high protection, and therefore there is the less reason for any increase of duty on our part.

I now, Mr. Chairman, ask the attention of the committee to the consideration of the immediate question, which I propose to discuss.

It must be remembered that prior to the year 1842, there had never been any duty laid on the importation of railroad iron. It was during this period, while this kind of iron was free of duty, that the Northern and several of the Southern Atlantic States went into the system of internal improvements, by making railroads. They completed some of their most important works, and obtained a fair start. This is a matter of the greatest consequence; for gentlemen will everywhere find that as soon as one or two roads are in successful operation in a State, it is easy to go on by fresh additions to the system. The main difficulty is in the start. It seems, hard, therefore, that while the older States in the beginning obtained their iron without any duty, that similar indulgence should not be extended to the new.

By the act of 1842, a duty of \$25 per ton was imposed on all rolled iron. Notwithstanding this enormous duty, there was not, for some years, any attempt to make railroad iron in the United States. In 1846, the price having risen in England to some \$50 per ton, the addition of this duty, together with other costs and charges incident to the importation, made railroad bar worth here from \$80 to \$90 per ton. A few establishments went into the business of manufacturing the article. There were seven or eight in Pennsylvania, and four or five in the rest of the United States. The reduction of duty and price, which soon followed the act of 1846, in a few years, caused most of these establishments to abandon that branch of business. I cannot ascertain, after diligent inquiry by letter, and also of the committee of iron-masters who have been here during the session, that more than three establishments have continued to make railroad bar. Their whole production is not supposed to exceed some thirty thousand tons.

I hold in my hand, sir, a statement of prices of merchant bar at Liverpool during a run of ten years, which was furnished me by these gentlemen during their sojourn here. I will read the average price for each year, beginning with 1843, the first year of the operation of our tariff of 1842, as follows:

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
1843.....	4	16	3	1848... ..	6	11	3
1844.....	5	10	0	1849.....	5	18	9
1845.....	8	5	0	1850.....	5	5	0
1846.....	8	17	6	1851.....	5	2	6
1847.....	8	12	6	1852, February & March.	4	15	0

It will be seen, sir, that this statement, furnished by themselves, singularly refutes, as far as facts go, their theories. They said that the tariff of 1842, though it might make iron higher at first, would in a

few years reduce it; but in point of fact the article continued to rise regularly each year, from 1843 to 1846.

When the act of that year reduced the duty, these gentlemen told us that there would probably be a sudden fall, and that in a little time the article would be higher than ever. But the reverse was the fact; the fall for the first year being a slight one, but increasing from year to year; regularly falling until the beginning of the present year, as far as their table goes, it including nothing after the month of March. At that time, according to this very statement, bar iron at Liverpool was worth, including shipping charges, only £4 17s. 6d. or \$21.66 reduced to our currency. It thus appears that these facts, with most obstinate perverseness, refuse to conform to the theories of the gentlemen.

There has, however, been within the last two months a considerable rise at Liverpool in the price of bar iron. This may be only temporary, as, according to the same statement I have read from, it occurred frequently within the last few years that there would be a variance within three months of more than ten dollars per ton, sometimes. It was for that reason that I have read the average statement of all the months in each year as given.

It may be, however, that the great demand for railroad iron has affected the price. The prospect of a continued peace in Europe has stimulated the construction of railroads there, in addition to the great demand here, and, perhaps, we may see the article rather higher for some time to come. It is often alleged, however by the friends of high duties, that this reduction has been purposely made by a combination of the iron-masters in England, to break down our establishments, so that they may, in the end, get a monopoly, and hereafter raise the price. Is this probable? In a statement in the memorial of the iron-masters of Pennsylvania, published by order of their convention, at Philadelphia, in December, 1849, it appears that the product of Great Britain was then as much as two millions of tons. It has since increased to nearly three millions of tons, according to statements which I rely on as substantially accurate. But from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the present session, we have, on page fifty-four, that the average foreign value of all the iron imported into the United States, in the latter part of the year 1846, was \$48 per ton. In the early part of the present year it was worth only \$21.66. If, therefore, we take the difference in price per ton, and multiply it by the whole number of tons produced in Great Britain, we shall find, by letting the price fall in this way, the iron men in that country have actually lost about \$70,000,000 in a single year. And for what reason is it that they consent to lose at this rate for a half-dozen years in succession? Why, merely, we are told, to enable them to break down these three iron establishments in Pennsylvania, which are making only thirty thousand tons per year. It would be far better for them to spend one or two millions, if necessary, in buying those works from the owners, and then having them to stand idle. Sir, the argument, often as it may be repeated, is preposterously absurd. The Sultan of Turkey might, with as much reason, assert that the cotton growers of

the United States had, by combination among themselves, reduced the price of cotton to break down his experimental cotton farm on the banks of the Bosphorus, began under the direction of our countryman, Dr. Davis. I admit, sir, that all production of iron, whether made in this country or out of it, tends to lower the price. It is also undoubtedly true, that if we should pour a barrel of water into the Potomac, that there would, by consequence, be more water in the Chesapeake Bay.

But manufacturers have candidly stated that they cannot make iron at the present rates, and that, unless we give them increased protection they must give up the business. That is really the question which they submit to us. I appeal to gentlemen all around to say whether there is any sufficient reason to justify this demand? Ought we to increase the present tax of thirty per cent., now oppressive on all parts of the country, just to enable a few establishments to make more money than they can now do? Have they any right to expect that we should do it? In this pamphlet to which I have already referred, they have given us a minute statement of the cost of making iron in Pennsylvania. All the items they set down as making a sum total of \$49 per ton at the works. They then state that it costs \$4.75 to get into the market—making \$53 75—and show, that when it is sold at \$55 per ton, the manufacturer's profit is only \$1.25. But we have it in their own published statement, which I now exhibit, that iron can be purchased in Liverpool at \$21.66, and that, after paying all the charges incident to importation, it can be had here for \$27.74, if free of duty. If, therefore, there were no duty on the article, the American purchaser could get it for \$27.26 less than they ask, or about one-half only of the price which they told us two years ago they were obliged to have. To enable, therefore, the manufacturer to realize \$1.25 per ton, you must make the purchaser lose \$27.26. Is it fair thus to treat one class of our citizens for the sake of another? Are not the farmers who are interested in the making of railroads, just as worthy, and in all respects as meritorious as the manufacturers?

But these gentlemen say that their iron furnaces give employment to laborers. Undoubtedly they do; but so does a railroad, and it is easy to show by calculation, as I did at the last session, that the making of a railroad gives employment to a much larger number of persons than does the furnace which merely makes the iron. They say, further, that these establishments afford a market to the farmers. This is true, as to those living in the neighborhood of the works; but my constituents, or the people of Illinois and Missouri, can no more pay for iron in Pennsylvania with their produce than they can in England. In either case they would be compelled to make the payment in cash, and, therefore, should seek the cheapest market. Besides, sir, the railroad, when made, will carry their produce to the markets of the world, and not to a single establishment that would be easily glutted. The benefit from this protection is small, and confined to a few; but the burden is large and diffused over the whole community.

I now, Mr. Chairman, ask the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Stevens) to the real cause of the difficulty under which

his people have suffered. The complaint there is owing to the excessive degree of protection heretofore given. Under the stimulus of the extravagantly high duty of the tariff of 1842, there was too great a rush of capital to the iron business, because in the most favorable localities enormous profits could be made. So much capital went into the business, that all the spare labor in that part of the country was at once absorbed by that occupation, and the competition among the iron-masters caused a great rise in the wages of laborers, and has produced a condition of things which cannot be permanently kept up. Since I presented this solution of the difficulty in the last Congress, I have some additional evidence to support the view. From the census returns, which have been published for the first time during the present session, I find that while the average rate of wages for male laborers in the iron factories of Pennsylvania is one dollar and six cents, in North Carolina it is only thirty-nine cents, and in Georgia it is only forty-three cents. Why this difference? What has produced such a condition of things? Clearly it is owing to the fact, that in those favorable localities in Pennsylvania the business was overdone, and more labor being required than could be had at the usual rates, wages rose thus high. I may be asked, however, if this is not a desirable thing. I need hardly say that I should be much gratified to see not only the iron manufacturers of Pennsylvania, but all the other laborers there, whether farmers or mechanics, and throughout the entire Union, receive not only one dollar, but ten or twenty a day. But this state of things cannot possibly be. As you can only raise prices partially and by legislation, the question is, whether it is right to impose a tax on those of our citizens who are getting but forty cents per day, to give others more than one dollar? Why oppress North Carolina and Georgia for the sake of helping Pennsylvania?

Mr. Brooks. Do not the laborers in the iron establishments in North Carolina receive as high compensation as those in Pennsylvania?

Mr. Clingman. I am glad the gentleman has asked me that question. I beg him again to look at this statement which I have read, and he will find that by the census returns which have been published, that the average price of labor in all the iron establishments in North Carolina is set down at thirty-nine cents; the average in the iron establishments in Georgia forty-three cents, and that of Pennsylvania one dollar and six cents. Now, if you will look at the price of labor in the cotton factories in Pennsylvania, according to the census returns, it is only sixty-five cents. There is a difference between the prices of labor in the cotton and iron manufactories of from sixty-five cents to one dollar and six cents.

Mr. Moore, of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will allow me, I will ask him whether he alludes, when he speaks of the price of labor in the cotton manufactories, to male or female labor?

Mr. Clingman. I allude to male labor only.

Mr. McNair. Is board included in this statement?

Mr. Clingman. The statement before me gives the rate of wages in all the States alike, without discrimination, and of course either board

is included for all or none in the comparative estimate of the census tables.

Mr. McNair. The price of board itself is eighty-seven and a half cents a day.

Mr. Clingman. Then the price of board must of course be included in the statement. My object is to show the difference in the rate of wages paid to the laborers in the cotton and iron manufactories in Pennsylvania. The average rates, as I said, is sixty-five cents a day for one, and one dollar and six cents for the other.

Mr. Moore, of Pennsylvania. In the cotton manufactories there are a great many minors. Does the gentleman include them in his estimate, or does he only refer to the labor of men?

Mr. Clingman. However that may be, the gentleman will see that it will not help him out of the difficulty. When I come down to North Carolina, I find that the price of labor in the cotton factories averages forty-four cents per day, which is five cents higher than that paid to those in the iron establishments there; and we employ boys in our cotton manufactories as well as you do in Pennsylvania. In Georgia the price of labor in the cotton manufactories is fifty-five cents per day, which is twelve cents higher than in the iron establishments of that State, also; so the gentleman will see that the fact that minors and boys are employed in the manufactories of Pennsylvania does not help him out of the difficulty.

But my explanation is the true one of the cause of the difference of forty cents per day between the rate of wages in the cotton and iron establishments in Pennsylvania. The government, as I said, by the duty imposed upon iron in the tariff of 1842, rendered the manufacture of iron so profitable that all the labor of the country was absorbed by the iron manufacturers, and such was the competition that the price of labor rose to the enormous rate of one dollar and six cents per day, while the labor in the cotton manufactories remained at sixty-five cents. This fact illustrates the principle which I am endeavoring to maintain. Pennsylvania is suffering from excessive protection. At these particular localities where these iron establishments were located, the business became so profitable as to raise the price of labor to that degree, that now that iron has fallen they cannot afford to make it on the same terms; while if the duty imposed had been only a moderate one, so many would not have gone into the business, and there would have been a steady advance.

What you want is a moderate check upon the system. I will make a few remarks upon a very singular statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, which I have no doubt gentlemen have seen incorporated in Mr. Corwin's report, as it is germane to this subject. But before I proceed to that matter, let me say that the price of labor in the manufacturing establishments of North Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee, no doubt indicates the rate of wages among the farmers; for if the farmers paid any higher rate, of course these people in the manufacturing establishments would not work for less. If this is true, the farmers of the South and West, and I have no doubt that the same is true in other States, are not realizing more than forty or fifty cents a day, and yet

gentlemen are clamorous in asking us to impose a tax upon these people who receive but forty or fifty cents a day, to enable others to get more than a dollar and six cents a day.

Mr. McNair, (interrupting.) I will say to the gentlemen that many of those who are employed in the iron works, have to spend many years in learning the art of manufacturing, and then they receive high wages, and that makes a very great difference.

Mr. Clingman. If the gentleman had attended to my remarks and referred to the census, he would have found that the average rate of wages included all the laborers, whether they receive high or low prices.

But how, Mr. Chairman, is it with the farmers? I am amused sometimes by gentlemen getting up upon this floor, as I was amused when I saw an article in the *National Intelligencer* to the same effect, complaining most bitterly of a tax of five per cent. upon madder, dye-stuffs, and other articles which the manufacturers consume. The manufacturers say it is great outrage to impose a tax of five per cent. upon what they use, but upon what the farmers use, they say thirty per cent. is not enough. The laboring farmers of the country are realizing but forty or fifty cents a day for their work, and the real question now is, whether you will impose a further tax upon them to enable these other people to make a dollar and a quarter. They say to the farmers who may complain, that the duty makes things cheaper. Then why do they not submit to it themselves? It is because they do not themselves believe in the argument; else why complain of the five per cent. tax on copper and fifty other things which they find occasion to use, and which are, to some extent, produced already in this country, and can be without limit. No, sir; their wish is to be exempt themselves from all share in supporting the government, and that all others may be taxed for their benefit. They have been so much petted, that they have been quite spoiled. Most of our tariffs have been made entirely to suit their wishes. The farmers and their representatives here, I am sorry to say, have looked too little into the details of the systems, and have permitted the manufacturers to have everything their own way. It is high time that there was a nearer approach to equality and justice.

But I wish, Mr. Chairman, to advert to an argument which has been put forward again and again; and I ask the attention of my friend from Tennessee, over the way, (Mr. Jones,) and others. These gentlemen say you are proposing to benefit corporations, but you will do nothing for the farmer; that you propose to take a duty off of railroad iron, but you do not touch plow iron. Now, I should like to show gentlemen, how little there is in this objection. These gentlemen have not surely looked into the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. From the last report (page 83) it appears that there were 254,000 tons of bar iron, manufactured by rolling, imported for the year 1851. Most of this was railroad iron. From another statement, furnished during the present session to my colleague, (Mr. Morehead,) by the Secretary of the Treasury, it appears that the exact amount of railroad iron imported for the year, was 190,199 tons. But all the

other kinds of bar-iron, not manufactured by rolling, according to the same report, (page 84,) imported for the year 1851, amount to only 20,198 tons. This includes the finer kind of Swede iron, as well as the plow iron imported. If it were all used by the farmers, instead of only a small part of it, it would still be but little more than one-tenth of the railroad iron imported. How absurd, then, is it to say, that it is a matter of great importance to relieve the farmers from a tax on 20,000 tons, but it is not worth while to remove a burden ten times as great. These gentlemen are extremely anxious to remove a mote from the eye of the public, but they are utterly indifferent about getting out the beam.

But is it true, sir, in point of fact, that the capitalists are interested in the railroads mainly, and that farmers are not? I can speak from some observation upon the subject. In North Carolina we have a few roads, but not so many as we ought to have, and would like to get more, and yet I find that those roads have not been made by capitalists. Moneyed men who want to make as much as possible, you will find invariably looking for more productive stocks. There is the Wilmington railroad, the stock of which my colleague, (Mr. Ashe,) very well knows is not now worth more than seventy cents on the dollar, and yet the very men who took that stock, and lost money on it, have since taken stock in other roads. Why is it? When you propose to construct a road in North Carolina—and I have no doubt that the same is true in the Western and Southern States generally—every farmer asks himself how much can he afford to lose for the sake of getting a public improvement; and after deciding that question, he takes as much stock as he can afford. So these roads are made by the farmers and the poor of the country mainly. And when they are made in any manner whatever, they benefit all classes. They enable the farmers to get their produce to market—to the sea-side, where they have the markets of the world. Every man who travels is benefited, too—and almost every one has to travel to some extent. The manufacturer is also as much benefited as any one else. He has the road to enable him to send his goods to the consumer in the country, and by the same facility he gets back his grain, and beef, and pork.

Nor does the benefit stop here. When this produce comes to the sea-side, you find that the ship-owner, and the merchant, take it and carry it abroad, whereby commerce is vastly increased and extended. Every class of the community, and every branch of business is thus benefitted.

Mr. Fuller, of Pennsylvania, (interrupting.) The gentleman has exhibited a very striking contrast between the rate of wages in the State of Pennsylvania, and the State of North Carolina, and has stated that the rate of wages in the iron establishments of Pennsylvania is \$1 06 per day, and forty-three cents in the State of North Carolina. I wish to know of him if he considers \$1 06 too high a rate of wages for a laboring man in any State of the Union?

Mr. Clingman. I have answered that question, and I will answer it again. I told gentlemen that I would like to see these laboring

people getting the highest wages. I hope the gentlemen will not interrupt me again, except with some new matter.

Mr. Fuller. What kind of men are they in North Carolina, who work for forty cents a day?

Mr. Clingman. The object of the gentleman is only to occupy my time, as I have answered that question.

I have said this: that when gentlemen propose to tax one man who is getting only forty cents a day, to enable another man to get more than \$1 00, I am not for it. I should be very glad to have these men get \$5 a day, or a much larger sum, but I am not willing to tax one set of men to give to another.

As I was saying, everybody has been struck by the immense increase of our foreign tonnage in the last two or three years. Why is it? Because the improvements of the country have carried a vast amount of its products which never before found their way there, to the sea-side, and they are now transported abroad.

But we hear a great complaint made of British free trade. When listening to this clamor, people would suppose that Great Britain was robbing us of everything, especially of our gold and silver, and that we were losing every year.

I find, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the commerce and navigation document for the last year, (page 46,) which any gentleman can read for himself, that Great Britain buys \$124,000,000 worth of products a year from us, and sends us back only \$105,000,000 of her produce, (page 270 of same document.) So that we actually sell her \$19,000,000 of property more than we take back from her, obliging her to make up this sum in specie to us. It is amusing to hear this great hue and cry against our commerce with Great Britain, when it is known that she not only buys more from us than all the world besides does, but \$19,000,000 more than she sells to us. That is equivalent to \$19,000,000 of specie upon our side. I should like to know if any one objects to that state of the case?

If you stop this trade with Great Britain, the result will be that the \$100,000,000 worth of cotton she now takes, and the rice, pork, tobacco, and the breadstuffs, &c., amounting to some \$20,000,000 and upwards, all are to be kept at home to rot on our hands. Great Britain only gets our cotton and other things by paying more than anybody else, and she is the largest and best customer therefore we have, and our trade with her is much the most profitable we have with any Power.

I now wish to make a remark upon a singular statement contained in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, (page 54.) It is a table, from which it appears that in 1848, we were consuming ninety-nine pounds of iron to each person, and that now we are consuming only sixty-nine pounds. This is a singular state of things if it be true. But what is the fact, and how does he get at it? Remember, in 1848, iron was worth nearly \$80 per ton, and it is now down to \$30. Is it not very extraordinary, therefore, that when iron was dear, you consumed ninety-nine pounds, and when it fell down to a much lower price, you consumed only sixty-nine pounds. Now, if it were true, that under this system of legislation, our people were so impoverished

that they could not consume the amount of iron they wanted, it would be a great and important question. But how do you get at these facts? I will tell you. The amount imported in each year is easily ascertained, but the error is in computing the amount of domestic production. It appears from the census of 1840, that we manufactured in the United States 286,000 tons of iron. It appears also, from the census of 1850, that we manufactured 564,000 tons, which is doubling the amount in ten years. That is the only data we have to go upon that is at all authentic. But when some of the manufacturers of Pennsylvania, a couple of years since, wanted to make a strong impression upon Congress, they got together and claimed upon the strength of estimates and conjecture merely that they did make 800,000 tons in the year 1848. This statement was gotten up expressly to induce Congress to give them further protection, they alleging that the manufacture of that article had fallen down to little or nothing then. Well, the Secretary of the Treasury has taken that statement made up in this way in December, 1849, at the instance of these iron manufacturers, and incorporated it into his report. If you take the census of 1840, and the census of 1850, you have something reliable to go upon. Though the census may be inaccurate, yet it is, after all, more likely to be right than any other statement. Yet, the Secretary of the Treasury has taken that statement and incorporated it into his report upon mere conjecture, and at the instance of persons interested to make the difference between the two periods as great as possible. Is there the slightest reason to believe in this statement?

I appeal to the judgment of every gentleman around me, are we not making more railroads in the United States now, than we ever have at any former time? Are we not making a larger number of ships? Both are great consumers of iron. Are we not constructing more steamboats and steamships, with their immense massive iron machinery, than at any former period? Are we not using iron for houses, bridges, and in a thousand ways, and to a greater extent than formerly? Are not our farming operations carried on with a greater consumption of iron than at any previous time?

I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the United States are consuming more iron now than at any earlier period of our existence. It is a strange, a most preposterous idea, that they do not consume it, because it is so cheap; and yet this statement is thrown out and copied into the newspapers, and harped upon from time to time, without persons taking the trouble to look into it, or see its fallacy.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are sometimes told that by submitting to a high price for a few years under protection, we shall in the end get the article cheaper. Even if this be conceded as a general principle, it cannot hold good as to railroad iron, if the iron-masters of Pennsylvania are to be relied on as good authority. In this same pamphlet, printed by them, from which I have been reading, it is said, that in making iron, the labor amounts to nine-tenths of the whole cost of production. It is also shown by the table, on page forty-six, that the cost of American labor on a single ton is \$11; and that the English

get the same done for \$3.71. Taking, therefore, the raw material in this country to be worth about the same that it is in England, it being, too, but one-tenth part of the whole cost, it appears that a ton of bar-iron can be manufactured in that country for \$20, at a better profit to the maker than the same would afford here when sold for \$50 per ton. Nor can this inequality ever be overcome, unless wages were correspondingly reduced in this country. This, I need hardly say, is not desired by those interested, and therefore there is no ground for us to hope that the burden they propose the nation should bear will be a mere temporary one. Conceding that the British have the advantage, however, in this particular manufacture, I am still of the opinion that those representing the iron interest have greatly exaggerated the difference. This very committee of iron-masters, to whom I have already referred, told me, during the present session, that they were able to make iron in Pennsylvania now, at \$10 per ton less than they did two years ago. This, they said, was owing to improvements and economy, and not to any reduction of wages. This remarkable fact has occurred, too, not under a high tariff, but under what they call a low one. It reminds me of what has occurred in England, with reference to the silk manufacture. While that business was heavily protected by the government, it languished; but since the duties have been reduced, it is prosperous.

These facts tend to show that it is necessary that people should rely on their own efforts for success. If the wagoner wishes Hercules to help him he must put his shoulder to the wheel. Even if all the duties were repealed, I have no doubt but that the iron manufacture would still go on, just as our farmers make corn at fifty, twenty-five, and even ten cents per bushel in some localities, because they cannot do better. Though they do not call upon us to tax others for their benefit, they have a right to insist that we shall not impose unnecessary burdens on them, to aid others who are already better off. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Ross) whose able speech has rendered it unnecessary for me to touch many points of the subject, showed that the iron business in his State was in a highly prosperous condition, and that more iron works had been built since 1846, than in an equal period before it. The minute knowledge he evinced on this branch, will not, I trust, be lost on the House or the country.

In the census table, furnished to us this session, it is stated that there is now in operation 10,814 miles of railroad. This will have to be relaid from time to time. There are also in progress of construction 10,896 miles of railroad in the different States of the Union. The duties under the present tariff on the iron necessary to complete these roads will amount to more than \$8,000,000, but the Secretary of the Treasury estimates the surplus on hand at the close of the present fiscal year at some \$20,000,000. Had we not better, therefore, repeal the duty, and thus enable all the States to finish their works? Pennsylvania herself, that is making several hundred miles of road which she is laying down with foreign iron, will be much more benefited as a State than injured by the measure. It will take half a million of dollars to pay the duty on the iron which will be required

on the roads in North Carolina, which we expect to have to purchase in the next eighteen months. The grading of the roads can be done by the farmers themselves, but the iron is a cash article, and why should its price be so much raised by an unnecessary tax, as I have shown this to be?

I admit, sir, that it is advantageous to a country that part of its labor should be employed in manufactures; but it must be such business as will sustain itself. It is clear that if any branch of manufactures is so unprofitable that it cannot support itself, but must be kept up by a tax on other more profitable occupations, it is a losing concern on the whole, and ought to be abandoned. All the countries referred to as having grown wealthier by reason of their manufactures, did so because they took care to engage in such kinds of business as they found convenient and profitable. England was referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Stevens.) She, however, tried the system of restriction until her starving population could no longer bear it, and five years ago she was obliged to repeal her tariffs, and adopt a comparative system of free trade. The consequence is that she is more prosperous than at any period of her existence.

Let me present to the House some statements professing to come from official sources, and furnished by the London correspondent of the *National Intelligencer*. Nobody will suspect that paper of an undue bias towards the side of free trade. The article in question will be found in the paper of March 27, 1852.

In the year 1845, the year before the repeal of the corn laws, the importations into the United Kingdom of wheat and meal were 1,141,957 quarters; and in 1851, the increase was no less than 5,355,687, or nearly five-fold. Remember, too, that the domestic production of these articles had increased, and ask yourself how vast the benefit conferred on the starving population of the country by this large increase of provisions consumed. Nine years ago, the consumption of sugar was 4,068,331 cwt.; last year it had risen to 6,884,189 cwt., or an increase of sixty-nine per cent. Not only are the people there able to pay for these articles which they consume, but all branches of manufacturing exhibit a proportionate increase, as is shown in the same article, as follows:

Again: if we look at the items of manufactures and exports, we shall find evidences of prosperity which are founded, we think, upon increased consumption of raw materials. Take the following brief tabular arrangement of the quantities of the leading varieties of raw materials, which passed through the hands of our manufacturers in the year 1842 and 1851, respectively:

	1842—lbs.	1851—lbs.
Cotton	486,498,778	645,436,624
Wool	44,022,141	69,346,893
Raw silk	3,856,867	4,059,449

The entire exports of the results of British industry, were, in 1842, £47,381,023; in 1851 they were £74,116,396; an increase within nine years of more than fifty per cent.

I might, by going further into detail, show still more clearly how much Great Britain has been benefitted by greater freedom of trade. Nor can it be pretended by any one cognizant of the facts, that she has made this advance at our expense. Our prosperity, as a nation, is greater than at any former period. The last half a dozen years show an advance that cannot be equaled by any period of similar length in our history. Money has been abundant; our domestic production, and export, at fair prices, much greater than ever before, while what we have had to purchase in turn from abroad, has been lower than formerly. Wages, generally, have been very high, and the necessities of life abundant and cheap. Even the cotton factories, which a year or two since were languishing from the high price of the raw material, are now doing well. Their numbers are on the increase, and they are generally at work on full time. According to a statement, which I think correct, they had taken for consumption of cotton, up to the latter part of May of this year, 509,293 bales. During the whole of last year, they used only 305,246 bales. If, in the latter part of the present year, they should take as much as they did for the corresponding period of last year, their consumption and manufacture would, for the present year, considerably exceed that of any former one, and be fifty per cent. greater than that of the highest year under the tariff of 1842. If a cotton or iron establishment is sold by the company for debt, the fact is at once paraded in certain newspapers, and charged to the want of a higher tariff; but when the same factory is started in new hands, or when others are built, these journals take no note of it, nor do they tell us how many farmers and merchants have their property sold by the sheriff or otherwise fail in business. I find, too, that our export of cotton goods was, in 1846, \$3,545,481, and in 1851, \$7,241,205, or more than doubled.

I now propose, Mr. Chairman, to direct the attention of the committee to another subject of great magnitude, viz: The modification of our navigation laws, and the relaxation of certain restrictions on commerce now existing. The period is perhaps a favorable one for such a discussion, because the public mind is now excited on the subject of the fishing difficulty. It is proposed by certain persons, that to obtain from Great Britain further fishing privileges in her waters, and also the right to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, we should adopt a system of free trade with Canada, &c., and so far repeal our tariff as to admit Canadian productions free of duty. If this be the whole extent we are to go, I am opposed to it. Why, sir, has not the country been told ten thousand times by the manufacturers, when asking for high duties, that though the farmers might thereby have to pay them a little more for their goods, yet it would be amply made up to them by the manufacturers, who would take their productions in turn, and give them better prices than they would get elsewhere. This story has been repeated until it is known to every child. And yet, sir, they gravely ask us to keep up the taxes on manufactured articles for their benefit, and to the oppression of the farmers, and nevertheless propose that they shall be allowed to go over to Canada, to purchase such foreign productions as they wish to consume, merely because such things

may be cheaper there than at home. Yes, sir, they wish the farmers to bear the burden of the tariff, while they have the benefit of free trade. Coming from them, this proposition is the most amazingly impudent one that the mind of man has ever conceived. It would be a very different thing if they proposed to put all persons on the same footing by a general repeal of duties, and permitting all to purchase where they could buy most advantageously.

With respect to our fishermen, I am as anxious as any one to advance their interest. They certainly, however, have no reason to complain of us. They are now, and have, from time immemorial, been sustained by bounties from our Treasury. In addition to getting the salt they use in curing fish free of duty, the bounty paid to them out of the Treasury is, according to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts himself, (Mr. Scudder) delivered a few days since, equal to \$22.32 for each person engaged in the business, including both ship-owners and fishermen. As they are employed but four months, it is therefore equal to \$5.58 per month added to their other profits. Would not the farming laborers of the country like to have given to them by the government \$5.50 per month, in addition to their wages? Instead of this, however, they have to pay in taxes the very money which the government gives over to the fishermen. The fish caught by them are certainly a good commodity, but not worth so much to the nation as the pork and beef of Ohio, Kentucky and other States, which gets no such bounty. It is said that the sailors thus employed serve in times of war to man our navy, and defend the country. This is, to some extent true; but it will hardly be affirmed that they render more important service than the riflemen of the western and southern country did at New Orleans, Buena Vista, and on many other well-fought fields, and yet, instead of giving these men bounties out of the Treasury, we impose taxes on them. I do not wish to be understood as insisting on a repeal of the laws giving these bounties to the fishermen, but only to show that they are, in fact, much favored already, while I am disposed to obtain for them further advantages, upon what I consider fair terms. What are these terms? Simply that, in addition to the fishing privilege, the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and free trade with Canada, we also so far modify our navigation laws as to extend the reciprocity system with Great Britain adopted a few years since, to the entire coasting trade of the two countries.

By the arrangement entered into some three years ago, our ships have the right to carry freight, &c., from any port of the British dominions to any other country, also from Great Britain to any one of her colonies, and from one colony to another. Her ships, too, have the right to carry from the United States of any other country; but our vessels cannot thus go from one port of Great Britain to another port of that island, nor from a port of one of her colonies to another port of the same colony, nor can her vessels take cargoes from one port of the United States to another in our country. I propose, then so to modify the existing system as to allow the vessels of both countries to participate in the coasting trade of each. Against this proposition a clamor is raised, and one gentleman said in my hearing that we had as well

abolish our navy. Everybody may remember, however, that there was a similar apprehension of mischief from the adoption of the reciprocity system in the foreign trade before it went into effect. But what has been the result? Instead of our commerce suffering there has been an immense increase, by reason of the free competition thus afforded. Yet Great Britain has not been prejudiced, but on the other hand, has been positively benefited. In 1848, the year previous to the repeal of the navigation act, the entire tonnage of the United Kingdom was 10,630,000; in 1851, it was 13,471,000—being an increase of some thirty per cent., an amount greater than the advance for an equal period at any former time. The increase of British tonnage engaged in the foreign trade, which entered the ports of Great Britain in the year 1851, as compared with that of 1849, is, however, only five per cent. But that of the United States in the same ports was as follows: For the year 1849, 586,987 tons, and in the year 1851, 779,664 tons—an increase of twenty-five per cent, in two years. It thus appears that, in her own ports, our tonnage has increased five times as much as hers since the adoption of the reciprocity system. How is the comparison on this side of the water? I have a statement for the port of New York, which I take to be accurate:

Calendar Years.	No. of arrivals.	Tons American.	Tons Foreign.	Total Tons.
1846.....	2,292	496,761	185,404	682,165
1847.....	3,147	605,482 $\frac{3}{4}$	333,537	939,019 $\frac{3}{4}$
1848.....	3,060	657,794 $\frac{1}{2}$	367,321 $\frac{1}{2}$	1,025,116 $\frac{1}{4}$
1849.....	3,227	734,908 $\frac{3}{4}$	414,096	1,148,104 $\frac{3}{4}$
1850.....	3,333	807,500 $\frac{1}{2}$	441,756 $\frac{1}{2}$	1,249,337
1851.....	3,840	1,144,485	479,566 $\frac{3}{4}$	1,624,051 $\frac{3}{4}$

From this it appears that within two years, viz: 1849 and 1851, whilst the increase at that port of British tonnage is fifteen per cent., that on our side amounts to seventy-eight per cent., or more than five times as much. We are, under the system of free competition, beating the British everywhere. For the accuracy of this statement with reference to the port of New York, I appeal to the gentleman representing it, (Mr. Brooks) who made an able speech on this subject in the last Congress.

Mr. Brooks. That increase of tonnage arises from two reasons: first, the annexation of California, which has caused an extensive commerce around Cape Horn, which we had not before. And, secondly, the British navigation act, which has opened all the British ports.

Mr. Clingman. By the British navigation act, the reciprocity system between both countries has been extended to the foreign trade. I am obliged to the gentleman for the candor of his admission. My object is to show that free trade upon the ocean has greatly increased our commerce, and thereby benefitted us. We now send more abroad because of this greater freedom of trade. It is a little singular, some gentlemen may think, that both countries should be benefited by this

change. The reason is this: in the first place by reducing the cost, you increase the amount of freights. We all know that when people can get their productions to market cheaper they sell a great deal more. In the next place, when one branch of business is glutted, the whole field being open, owners of vessels can shift from one employment to another.

What I propose, Mr. Chairman, is this: I am willing to agree with Great Britain, that if she will allow our fishermen the privileges they desire, and give us the navigation of the St. Lawrence to boot, I will go for Canadian free trade, provided we also extend the reciprocity system to the coasting trade of both countries. We shall thus greatly benefit our agriculturalists. Why should not the farmer, when his produce gets to the sea-side, have the right to send it anywhere in the ship that will carry it cheapest? Two years since I had occasion to state that it cost more to take freight from New Orleans to New York than from New York to Canton, on the opposite side of the globe. This is a heavy tax on the cotton, pork and flour that goes down the Mississippi.

Why should people be longer compelled to submit to it? By letting in the competition of British ships, and stopping the monopoly, we should lower freights, and benefit all the producers of the country. Great Britain is able to give us a sufficient equivalent in the way of exchange. Unless, however, this is to be done, I am opposed to Canadian reciprocity. That would be simply giving Canada all the benefits of being in our Union, without her contributing anything to support our government. Of course it is good policy for her, and I do not wonder that Sir Henry Bulwer, the British minister, was anxious for it. Its adoption would tempt a portion of our population to go over into Canada. They might thus escape the high tariff of this country, and buy British goods cheap for their own use, and yet have the privilege of selling all they made in this country. I repeat, I am willing to adopt a general system of free trade, but not a partial one for the advantage of a particular class or section.

I have, Mr. Chairman, discussed these topics with little expectation that in the ten days which remain of the present session, we shall see any legislation on them, but rather in the hope that at some early day of the next session, Congress may be induced to act on them. During my time on this floor I have witnessed important results, and great changes of public opinion, effected by discussion in these halls; and, if, at this time, I could, by directing the attention of gentlemen to the consideration of these points, be instrumental in any manner, or to any extent, in convincing the minds of a majority of the propriety of these views, I should feel quite confident that, sooner or later, they would, through the medium of the press and otherwise, bring public opinion to that condition that would affect the proper legislation to carry them into practical operation. I thank the committee for its attention, and will no longer occupy its time.

[In the early part of 1852, it became manifest that in the selection of a Whig candidate for the Presidency, a great effort would be made by those controlling the Northern wing of the party, to choose a standard bearer regarded as hostile, or at least not committed, to the compromise measures of 1850. There seemed to be a settled purpose on the part of such leaders as Mr. Seward, to reject Messrs. Webster and Fillmore especially, on account of their friendship for those measures. General Scott had been induced to place himself in a position that seemed to render him available for their purposes. As the spring advanced, I became satisfied that the anti-slavery elements in the party would control it. The success of the party under such circumstances, would be more disastrous to the country than its defeat. Believing that desperate disorders would justify remedies of a decisive character, I went to work to produce one of two results. Either to induce the Southern Whigs to refuse to join in calling a national convention, except on such conditions as would certainly frustrate the purposes of the anti-slavery agitators; or, to break up the party as a national organization.

A circumstance seemed to favor such a movement. President Fillmore hesitated to allow his name to go before the convention, as a candidate for the nomination, and was considering the propriety of peremptorily withdrawing from the contest. He was pressed to take this step, by certain influences in his cabinet. Mr. Webster and his friends were extremely desirous that Mr. Fillmore should withdraw, in order that the conservative elements of the party might be concentrated on Mr. Webster. Mr. Crittenden, the Attorney General, was a most zealous friend of General Scott, and likewise anxious that Mr. Fillmore should retire, in the belief that thus, Scott's most formidable rival might be gotten rid of. The pressure on Mr. Fillmore from these two sources, caused him to decide to give way, and I was apprised that at an early day he would announce his determination not to be a candidate for the nomination.

I saw in succession, privately, many of those Southern Whigs, who were most hostile to the Seward-Scott movement, and induced them to agree that if Mr. Fillmore did decline, in respect to which there was some intimation in the papers, they would join in a public declaration against the convention and advise the Southern Whigs to decline to go into it. Mr. Fillmore's purpose to withdraw was resisted by a few of his friends, and delayed somewhat, but I had the most reliable information, that on a day not more than one week in advance, his decision would be made public.

The Hon. Humphrey Marshall called one morning to see me, and he was strongly conservative in his views, and exceedingly averse to the Scott movement then. I explained the matter to him, and asked his cooperation in my plan, so that we might by such action either compel the Northern wing to abandon the purpose to select Scott, and consent that Mr. Webster or some one occupying a similar position should be our nominee, or if we failed in this to break up the Whig party, and form a new organization that should not be controlled by the anti-slavery elements.

Contrary to my expectations, however, Mr. Marshall suddenly became excited and said: "No, I cannot agree to break up the Whig party." It became known thus that if Mr. Fillmore should withdraw, the result would be that the party would be disrupted. Immediately thereafter, the policy of the friends of Messrs. Webster and Scott were changed, and Mr. Fillmore was pressed to stand, in order that he might,

as the event proved, be made useful in holding the party together for the benefit of General Scott.

When a caucus of the Whig members was called to take into consideration the subject of calling a convention, there were manifested great differences of opinion, and finally a number of the Southern representatives seceded from it, and published an address to the country explaining their reason for so doing. The points involved in the controversy are sufficiently set forth in the following letter to the Editor of the *Republic*:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 10th, 1852.

To the Editor of the Republic:

SIR: A friend has called my attention to an article in your paper of Saturday last, which makes such reference to me as justifies my asking some space in your columns. The article I refer to has been copied, at the request of the Hon. Ben. Edward Grey, from the *Louisville Journal*. In justice to my friend from Kentucky, Col. Grey, I think it right to say that I know that in asking its republication he was not at all influenced by any desire to give currency to that comparatively small portion of it which referred especially to myself. Though none who knew the character of the *Louisville Journal* would regard me as under any obligation to notice any attack which it might contain, or to have any controversy with its editor, yet your having republished it, and at the request, too, of a highly respectable member of Congress, places the matter in a different light. I avail myself, therefore, of the occasion thus offered, because I desire to present some points connected with the action of the late Whig Congressional Caucus, which are not only necessary to my own defence, but may also be of interest to the public.

Waiving, therefore, the consideration of the general topics which have been so fully discussed in the address of the seceding members already published, I will confine my remarks to a brief statement of some of the essential points. In the first place, I did not leave the caucus simply because it refused to adopt the precise resolution offered by Mr. Marshall or by Mr. Gentry. As I stated, these propositions did not, in my opinion, go as far as they should have done; and, therefore, I proposed an additional one by way of amendment. I also reminded the presiding officer that in the caucus held for a similar object four years ago, at which the same gentleman, my colleague, Mr. Mangum, presided, the question as to whether there should be any National Convention at all was entertained as the preliminary proposition, and that there had been much discussion, and various suggestions relating to that single question; and that in fact on the first evening of our meeting no other subject was taken up for consideration; and that it was not until some weeks after we, by a vote of the caucus, had settled this as a preliminary question, that the time and place of holding the convention were fixed. I also argued that if, in accordance with this former precedent, such a question was now entertained, we might either determine to recommend that there should be no convention at all, or recommend it with qualifications or conditions. Though the chairman stated that he well remembered that such had been the course of proceeding at the time referred to, yet he declined to follow that precedent. It was because he decided that he

should hold out of order any proposition except such as related to the time and place, which decision was sustained by the majority, that I declined to take further part in the proceedings of the caucus.

My reasons, as briefly given and already published, were as follows. I copy them from the *Southern Press* of April 24:

“REMARKS OF MR. CLINGMAN IN THE CAUCUS.—Mr. President, if the same indulgence is extended to me that has been given to other gentlemen during the discussion of this point of order, I can say all I desire to say to the meeting. It is the more necessary that I should offer a few words, because, though I agree substantially with those gentlemen, yet neither of the propositions submitted by my friend from Kentucky, (Mr. Marshall,) or by my friend from Tennessee, (Mr. Gentry,) precisely meets my own views. It is well known that I not only voted against most of the Compromise bills, but that I have also voted more recently against the resolutions approving them. To prevent misrepresentation, therefore, and in order that my position may be properly understood, I have prepared a proposition, which I intend to offer as an amendment, or an additional resolution to any that might be presented. It not only meets my own views, but those also of some other gentlemen here present. Your decision, however, ruling the propositions already presented out of order, undoubtedly embraces this, and I therefore will not needlessly consume your time by pressing a decision on it. I say, then, that I cannot support the pending proposition to fix the time and place for holding a National Convention. I will not in any mode give my sanction to the calling of such a convention unconditionally. If I were to do so I should feel myself bound in honor to support its nominee. I am, therefore, willing to join in calling it only on conditions such as are expressed in part by my resolution. I am willing that those gentlemen who desire to do so shall hold a convention and present a nominee; but I shall then decide for myself whether I vote for that nominee or not. I mean to say that I shall not support the individual merely because he has been nominated by that convention.

“The nomination will neither help nor hurt the person selected, in my judgment. I wish, therefore, to be understood as neither advocating nor opposing the calling of this convention, and do not mean to be bound by its action to go further than my sense of duty may prompt. I shall hereafter, upon a full view of all the circumstances, determine what I ought to do.

“The following is the resolution intended to have been offered:

“Whereas, by the series of measures commonly called the Compromise, California has been admitted into the Union as a State, the boundary of Texas has been settled, territorial governments have been established for Utah and New Mexico, and the slave trade in the District of Columbia has been abolished, and these several measures have been acquiesced in and carried into effect; and whereas resistance has been made in certain places to the execution of the Fugitive Slave law, and efforts are being made to effect its repeal, or render negative and null its provisions: Therefore—

“*Resolved*, That in view of these things, and inasmuch as, under the

Constitution of the United States, we are entitled to an efficient Fugitive Slave law, that we have a right to require that this latter law shall be sustained and carried out in good faith, and that any National Convention nominating a Presidential candidate shall, in unequivocal and plain language, declare it to be the purpose of said convention faithfully to carry out this law and that its nominee shall express his concurrence in such a proposition."

What inconsistency is there between my present and former positions? Is not my resolution true in its statement of facts? Those features of the so-called Compromise which I and others at the South objected to, have already been carried into effect. California has been admitted as a State, and Texas has given up her right to the territory claimed for New Mexico by the North, and Congress cannot now change this condition of things. The territorial governments of New Mexico and Utah are practically just as secure from repeal, and have been carried into effect. So, too, is it with the law abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia. Though these several measures were condemned by myself and others from the South, yet no attempt has been made to repeal them, nor does any one expect to prevent their being carried out, or in any way to defeat their operation. But how is it with the Fugitive Slave law, which the southern friends of the Compromise constantly refer to as the equivalent given by the North in exchange for the concessions made by the South? There are not only powerful and organized efforts in the North for its repeal or modification, but even its execution, while standing on the statute-book, has in many places been successfully resisted. At Boston a mob entered the court-house, and while the judge was sitting on the bench, and in the presence of the assembled multitude, by force liberated and carried off a fugitive slave. At Syracuse a similar mob rescued another fugitive from the United States marshal, though he struggled against them till he was overpowered, and his arm was broken. At Christiana the fugitives were aided, and the master murdered, by a like concourse of violaters of the law. In the great States of Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania, these things were done in open day, and in the presence of hundreds, and yet no one of the wrong-doers has been convicted of any offence. After repeated attempts to prosecute a part of the Government officers, they have been obliged to consent to the discharge of the criminals. This fact, better than an hundred witnesses, proves the state of feeling which prevades the popular mind in these localities. If there was not a strong and general sympathy for the criminals, some one of them would have been convicted. I might refer to similar manifestations elsewhere, but they are sufficiently known already. Why more than a year ago the Legislature of the State of Vermont passed an act utterly nullifying all the provisions of the Fugitive Slave law. This proceeding was loudly complained of at the time, and it was said, to quiet the public mind, as I remember by the papers in this city, as well as elsewhere, that the act had been passed hastily, did not meet the views of the people of the State, and would be repealed by the next Legislature. But, unfortunately for the prophets, when last winter the Legislature reassembled, the proposition to repeal this act of nullification was rejected by a vote of nearly three to

one—making it manifest that the settled action of the State was against the execution of the law of Congress. A similar nullifying law a few weeks since, according to the statements published in the papers, passed the Senate of Massachusetts, and only failed in the House by a vote of one hundred and sixty-two to one hundred and seventy-eight. Such things, when they occur in the Northern States now, do not even excite the comment of some of the national papers here at the seat of Government. But if the State of South Carolina, which, without actually carrying it out, has threatened to nullify, in former times; if this State, I say, were really to nullify, or seriously even threaten to nullify any act of Congress of as much importance as the one under consideration, the whole country from this point to Canada, and such portions of the Southern people as sympathize mainly with Northern movements, would at once be thrown into a state of ferment, and the Executive would be compelled by the force of public opinion to send as many troops as were at his disposal to Sullivan's Island or other points on the coast of that State to endeavor to overawe her.

But it is not necessary for me to argue further to show that there are serious obstacles in the way of the execution of the Fugitive Slave law of 1850, or of any legislative provision to carry out that feature of the Constitution. The expense alone of recovering a fugitive is sufficient to defeat the object of the law. That expense would not be necessary were it not for the resistance made by the mobs to its execution.

In support of my own course and views, I quote a paragraph from the address already published by the seceding members. Let it be borne in mind that they are all, except Mr. Morton and myself, supporters of the Compromise measures. It is in the following words:

"After another series of years new acquisitions of territory were made—new disputes arose touching the same powers and the same questions. A new compromise was made, whereby the balance of power was yielded by the slaveholding States, and the reins of empire were delivered up to the free States by the admission of California into the Union. The slave trade was suppressed in the District of Columbia, territorial governments were created over the whole public domain, and an act was passed to enforce the delivery of fugitives from labor. This settlement being made, has the South murmured at the law suppressing the slave trade in this District? Look upon the opposite picture. Reply to your own hearts, how has the law for the delivery of fugitive slaves been executed? We ask merely that the Whig party shall not go behind this last settlement; that it shall nationalize itself by taking a firm and true position upon the finality of this settlement, and shall hold its members bound, without regard to former opinions, to maintain and enforce this settlement in good faith, and honestly."

The view here taken substantially accords with my own position. I was originally opposed to this system of measures. Inasmuch as the Constitution expressly provided that fugitives should be given up, I thought that we were entitled as a matter of right, without bargain, to an efficient law to carry into effect that provision. I did not, therefore, consent to pay the price demanded. But it was determined otherwise; and the measures relating to the disposition of the territorial acquisitions

have been executed, and are now beyond recall. The Fugitive Slave law alone is executory in its character, and is liable to be repealed, modified, or resisted.

Though I regarded the bargain as a whole as an unwise one, yet, since what we have paid cannot be gotten back, have I not a right to insist that the other party shall pay what was promised, even though it be less than I hold it ought to have been? If a man were to convey by deed to another a piece of land worth one thousand dollars, with a promise of only five hundred in return for it, might you not well say to him that he has made a bad trade, but that, as his land was gone forever, he ought to insist that the purchase-money should at least be paid? This view of the case is so clear and easy of comprehension, that I must be excused for doubting the sincerity of any one who professes not to understand it. At least, he who does not see it, is covered by a coating of stupidity thick enough and hard enough to turn the edge of any argument, however sharp it may be, and however forcibly driven.

From the day of the passage of these measures, I have said again and again that, notwithstanding the great concession made to the North, it would not remain satisfied, and that the Southern compromise men would soon be put on the defensive again. I have all the while held myself ready to co-operate with them. Having failed to maintain successfully my own position for the want of a larger number of allies, it is my duty to fall back on the next line of defence that seems tenable. What would be thought of a soldier who in battle, because the advanced position which he wished defended was abandoned, should refuse to co-operate with his comrades in defending any other line which might be occupied by them? Feeling confident that the Abolitionists would not give quarter to my countrymen, duty and patriotism required that I should be ready to aid them whenever they found it necessary to make a stand.

It will be seen that my resolution went beyond those of the other gentlemen with whom I was co-operating. It in substance proposed that we should not give the sanction of a congressional caucus of the Whig party to the holding of any national convention, except upon condition that certain principles should be adopted as a basis of action. But it is said that we are disposed to thrust a sectional issue upon the convention. It is not so; for the Constitution of the United States is binding in all its provisions on all sections of the Union, and must be carried out in all its features by every citizen. He, therefore, who is opposed to the enforcement of any one of its provisions, is himself a *sectional* man, and ought therefore to be excluded from all part in the proceedings of any national convention. Before entering into a political partnership with any set of men, we have a right to require that they shall adopt principles co-extensive with the Constitution and the rights of all sections under it. And if the individuals composing the body about to assemble really entertain proper national feelings, why should they hesitate to say so? It is the high privilege of American freemen to speak the truth, and why should they not exercise this great right?

The fact cannot be denied, that within the last half a dozen years a large portion of the so-called Whig party has become a mere northern sectional anti-slavery party. To show how this was brought about would

extend the limits of this letter too much, and I content myself with a reference to a few well-known prominent facts. In the thirtieth Congress every member of the House of Representatives from the free States regularly voted for the Wilmot proviso, with a view of excluding the South from the occupation of every acre of the Mexican territory. The fact that fifteen States, by their legislative action, adopted this proviso, shows how general and pervading was this feeling among all parties at the North. And in the Presidential canvass following, viz., of 1848, the section of the party in those States took extreme anti slavery ground. When, therefore, the thirty-first Congress assembled, it was found that all of the eighty-four Whig members from the North had been, either by their own declarations, or by the resolves of the nominating district conventions, pledged to put the proviso on the territorial governments, and to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. Though different in name, yet these gentlemen agreed in principle with that large section of the Abolition party which supported John P. Hale as a Presidential candidate. While they all professed a regard for the Constitution, and disclaimed all purpose to interfere with slavery in the States, yet they alike asserted not only the right, but also the duty, of Congress to exclude slavery wherever it had jurisdiction, and especially to prohibit it in the Territories, and abolish it in the District. It will be recollected that in the Congressional caucus which assembled at the commencement of the session of the last Congress, when a discussion on these points sprung up on the presentation of Mr. Toombs' resolution, that a gentleman from New York, Mr. Brooks, declared that he had had a conference with his colleague from the city, (understood to be Mr. Briggs,) and that they had determined not to vote at that session (the first one) for any proposition to abolish slavery in the District. Notwithstanding the pressing and urgent nature of the discussion on that occasion, no other gentleman from the North made a similar declaration, while many who did speak asserted the contrary. It was a full knowledge of this state of things that induced me shortly after to declare, on the floor of the House, that I regarded the Northern portion of the Whig party as neither national nor conservative, but eminently sectional and *destructive* in its policy. It is true that during the progress of the session several public-spirited and patriotic gentlemen from that section changed their position; but their number was so inconsiderable, compared with the whole, as not materially to change the position of the party, only three voting for the Fugitive Slave act, even after they had obtained the admission of California, and other measures relating to the Territory. Since that time a favorable change has, in certain portions of the free States, been going on, but it has not yet progressed to that point which would justify any one in saying that the Whig party of the North, as a body, occupies national ground. This, however, is what we propose they shall do in the approaching convention; otherwise they have not the shadow of a claim to justify them in asking our co-operation. Should that convention adopt a national platform with the assent of its nominee, those who aid in his election will be compelled to defend the principles upon which he stands.

By consequence, Abolitionist, Higher law men, and all enemies to any feature of the Constitution, must either adopt our principles or be thrown

out of the party altogether. The collision and discussion between our friends and these persons will, I think, result in their being crushed. Such certainly I believe will be the effect, if the Democratic party should also take an unequivocal, national platform. The South, as the section most interested in the pending questions, ought to hold herself in position to co-operate with such party in the North as may stand upon truly national ground. But should neither of the prominent parties take such a position, the country is to see merely a struggle for the offices, a contest scarcely worthy of the consideration of statesmen. Let us suppose, on the other hand, that the Democratic Convention should take proper ground, and that of the Whig party fail to do so. The result would be that the Whigs, being in position to court the Abolitionists, would win them over by adopting entirely their doctrines, and have their aid in breaking down their Democratic rivals, whom they would stigmatize as pro-slavery men, &c. In such a proceeding it becomes not me to take part. If they can get into power by such means instead of my assistance they shall have my determined opposition. If the friends of the Constitution are to be exterminated, I shall not join in the war against them. If Webster is to be crushed in Massachusetts, and Dickinson trampled down in New York, because they have been willing to do what, in their judgment, the Constitution required them to do in behalf of the rights of the South, I at least will not fight in the ranks against them. If the blood of our allies is to be shed, it shall not stain my hands. Concurrence in such a proceeding would, on the part of Southern men, be not only criminal, but in the highest degree impolitic. There would be a terrible recoil on us. When hereafter the anti-slavery party, invigorated by this process, and flushed with victory, shall assail us, and we the minority call upon patriotic men of the North to aid us, what response can we expect? Will they not point us to the graves of our former northern allies, and remind us that we are in the habit of throwing off our friends the moment we cease to need their aid, and of permitting them to be sacrificed to gratify the vengeance of the Abolitionists? We shall be left to our own energies, and a collision between the two sections will most probably result in the overthrow of the Government. The whole anti-slavery movement in the North has been unconstitutional and sectional. They have sought to pervert from their legitimate purposes the powers with which the Federal Government was invested for the protection of all the States and their citizens, and to use them as a means of attack against the people of the Southern States. It is not less unjust than it would be if the guns on the ramparts of a fortress, stationed there to repel the external enemy, should be turned inward by those having them in charge, and fired at a part of the garrison. Instead of co-operating with such traitors to the Constitution, it is the duty of the South to oppose them. My advice to the men of my own section is to come together, so that they may in a body stand by the national men of the North. If we do that, we shall have friends enough there to assist us in giving the Government a national line of policy. As long as we are divided—as long as we give as much aid to our enemies as to our friends—we may expect to be sufferers.

I have confined my remarks for the present to the bearing merely of the slavery questions. Of course, there are other important points of

policy to be considered in connexion with the choice of candidates for the Presidency. I wish to be understood as being neither the advocate nor the opponent of any named candidate. What I have said has, as it purports to have, reference only to general principles of action. If I have made no reference to the action of the Northern Democracy, it is not because I do not find matter for condemnation. As I am not connected with them by party affinity, of course I am in no way responsible for their past or future conduct. My purpose at this time is merely to show upon what terms I am willing to co-operate with the northern section of the Whig party.

I have thus rapidly and hurriedly glanced at some of the points now under discussion in the prints of the day. My purpose has been to compress what I wished to say within such narrow limits, that those editors who regard my individual course as a matter of sufficient moment to the public to justify their making it a matter of discussion, may be able to place these views before their readers without a sacrifice of too much space in their columns.

Very respectfully,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

Attempts were made from time to time, until the meeting of the convention, to harmonize the Northern and Southern wings of the party but with little success. Though apparently the contest seemed in a great measure to relate to the endorsement of the Fugitive Slave Law, yet it really reached much deeper. By this time many of the Southern Whigs saw that the real object of the Seward wing was to continue the agitation of the slavery issue, and by killing off Fillmore and Webster, to deter others from manifesting moderate views. Finally, when the convention assembled, to conciliate the South, the Scott men adopted a platform that was satisfactory upon the whole, and took their own candidate. In order that they might while supporting the candidate, feel at liberty to "spit upon the platform," as Mr. Greeley in his *Tribune* put the case, General Scott, in his letter of acceptance, studiously avoided endorsing the platform.

This device, however, failed, though perhaps it promised as much as any other contrivance could have effected. It was obvious that a fatal breach existed between the Northern and Southern wings of the old Whig party. Scott's course not only drove off so many men from his party in the South, that he obtained only two States, but even in the North so many moderate men left him that in that section he was able to carry but two States. And when in the next Presidential election Mr. Fillmore was nominated to satisfy the compromise men, he did not obtain a single Northern electoral vote. In a word, the adoption of extreme anti-slavery views by its Northern members, rendered it impossible that it should exist as a national organization.

To indicate the tone of argument upon which General Scott was opposed and broken down in the South, my letter to Dr. Mills is presented :

Letter to Dr. Ladson A. Mills.

RALEIGH, October 8, 1852.

Dear Sir: In compliance with your request, I proceed briefly to state, in writing, the substance of my conversation with you in relation to

the approaching Presidential election. I do this the more readily, not only because I have no political opinions that I wish to conceal, but because as one of my immediate constituents you are entitled to have them in a form capable of preservation for future reference.

From the time of General Scott's nomination I have universally stated, in conversation with my colleagues, other members of Congress, and in fact all who felt an interest in knowing my views, that I did not intend to support General Scott. In reply also to such letters as I received, asking for my opinion, I repeatedly wrote to the same effect, to gentlemen of both political parties who were residents of my district, and also to some from other portions of the State. Several of these letters were written soon after General Scott's nomination, to gentlemen of both parties canvassing for seats in the Legislature. I mention this lest it should be charged that I hesitated to commit myself in writing, since it was easy for any one of those gentlemen—there being no injunction of secrecy on them—to have furnished evidence of my position. I did not think it expedient to make a publication on the subject, partly because it was said by the papers friendly to General Scott, that members of Congress ought not to attempt to dictate to the people, and in part, also, because I preferred giving my views to my constituents face to face, in a full and free manner, on my return to my district.

In 1848, seeing that the contest was likely to be between General Taylor and General Scott, and that the former had refused to take any position with reference to the great pending questions of the day, and not being disposed to adopt him on trust, and blindly support him, I, after long waiting for a development of General Taylor's views determined to advocate the nomination of General Scott, rather than his. Since then I have had no reason to regret that course. As I apprehended and predicted, as soon as the policy of General Taylor's administration was developed, with reference to the great slavery questions then pending, I, in conjunction with a majority of the Southern Whig members of Congress, was thrown into opposition to it. Though such was the condition of things for several months before General Taylor's death, yet the public was not generally aware of it. His sudden demise prevented an open and violent collision. About the first of July, 1850, it was determined, at a meeting of a decided majority of the Southern Whig members of Congress, that it was our duty, before an open declaration of hostilities, to advise the then President of our purposes, &c. Three gentlemen were selected for that purpose, to wit: the Hon. C. M. Conrad, the present Secretary of War, the Hon. Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, and the Hon. Robert Toombs, of Georgia. They, in accordance with the views of the meeting, separately called on the President and gave him to understand that he must expect our determined opposition if he persisted in resisting such a compromise as we advocated, and insisted on his policy of admitting California and New Mexico as States, and supporting the claim of the latter to the territory on this side of the Rio Grande. According to their several reports to us, General Taylor was unyielding, and frankly declared to them that as soon as the Constitution of New Mexico

reached him, which he looked for in a few days, he should send in a message to Congress recommending its admission at once as a State, as he had done in the case of California; that he also declared that Texas had no right to the territory claimed by her, and that he was disposed to support the claim of New Mexico against her. To one of these gentlemen, he said that he was placed in such a position that he would probably be forced to sacrifice one wing of his party; and that we ought not to expect him to sacrifice eighty-four men from the North rather than twenty-nine men from the South, these being the number of members of the Northern and Southern sections of the Whig party in Congress. The great body of the Southern members of Congress, with Mr. Clay at their head, would thus have been thrown into opposition, and would have been compelled, with the aid of the conservative men of the North, to fight the whole force of the administration. The death of General Taylor alone prevented a struggle which would have shaken the country to its centre. The decree of Providence thus averted the contest, but the lesson is one which ought not to be lost on us. Without, however, going into detail on these points, I proceed at once to speak of General Scott.

In the summer of 1849, his Canada annexation letter was published. General Taylor having just been inaugurated, it seemed probable that he might be re-nominated for election, with the support, as it was then supposed, of the whole South. It would be necessary to secure the Northern vote in opposition, to supersede him. General Scott, therefore, while expressing his wish for the acquisition of Canada, voluntarily and without being questioned on the point, went on to declare his opposition to the acquisition of Mexican territory. In substance he said that while he was for taking territory that would strengthen the North, he was opposed to such acquisition as might in like manner keep the South even with the North. I then looked upon this as an open, undisguised declaration of his wish to be regarded as the *Northern* presidential candidate. It could be considered in no other light than as a bid for Northern support at the expense, too, of our essential interests. During my journey through the Northern States in the autumn of that year, I had other evidences to the same effect. I felt that General Scott had not, in the position he had voluntarily taken, any claims on me or any other Southern man. On the contrary, I saw that the rights of my section under the Constitution, as equals in the Union, had been put up for sale in the political market for anti-slavery votes. It was obvious that General Scott believed he could be elected by Northern votes alone. In fact I have the best reason to believe that he, much more recently than the time I refer to, repeatedly expressed the opinion that he could be elected without a vote from a slave State. For the last three years he has been identified with the anti-slavery party of the North; but in 1848, Mr. Seward, who is the leader of that party, was opposed to him. During the session of the Whig Convention at Philadelphia, in that year, I had some conferences with Mr. Thurlow Weed, the editor of the *Albany Evening Journal*, and with Mr. Horace Greeley, the editor of the *New York Tribune*, both of them being well known as intimate

friends and mouth pieces of William H. Seward. They were utterly hostile to General Scott, and said he could not possibly be supported by them, on account of his Nativism and various other points enumerated by them. Why is it that Mr. Seward and these gentlemen have since taken up General Scott and given him the nomination? Because they found they could make use of him to destroy Messrs. Fillmore, Webster, and other friends of the compromise; and they therefore seized upon him as a fitting instrument for that purpose. But, it is said, that he had in his private conversations expressed himself in favor of those measures. If it be true, it makes the case stronger against him. After the passage of the bills, a fierce attack was made on those men at the North who had had the liberality to assist in getting them through. Seward and his followers took the field to crush Webster and Fillmore. But while the storm of war was raging for their destruction, where was General Scott? As they had only done what he thought it was their duty to do, why did he not stand by them like a man? A sentence from his pen declaring his approbation of their course would have materially aided them. Though appealed to again and again, he would not write it. On the contrary, he allowed his name to be inscribed on the banners of their enemies. It was under the cover of his military glory that Seward and his clan fought the battle against our allies. Was such a proceeding fair and honorable on the part of General Scott? Let me state a similar case for illustration. Suppose that, during the Mexican campaign, a portion of his army had, in accordance with his approbation, taken an advanced and dangerous position, which nevertheless it was necessary for the safety of the army should be taken; suppose, too, that when they had been fiercely assailed by Santa Anna and his armies, that General Scott, though able to protect them, had stood aloof and allowed them to be destroyed; suppose, too, that he had, without objection, permitted Santa Anna to carry his own banner, and fight them thus, in the name of General Scott, who ought rather to have protected them; and suppose, to crown all, that General Scott had then become the associate and triumphant leader of Santa Anna's party! To show that the cases are alike you have only to substitute Fillmore and Webster, who took the extreme position for the Compromise with General Scott's approbation; then put Seward, Johnston, and other Abolitionists as their assailants instead of Santa Anna and his followers. Under General Scott's banner and in his name they have fought and conquered our allies in the North; and General Scott takes the nomination from their hands. But it may be said that such a case as I have put could not have occurred; that General Scott as an honorable soldier, would not have so acted, and that he, in fact, did refuse the presidency from the Mexicans. All this I admit. General Scott, *the soldier*, would not have so behaved, but in the field of politics has he not so acted? I agree that he has done so because he was entrapped by the politicians, who were more cunning than he. Many of his friends try to evade it by saying that though under the influence of ambition, he acted wrong to get the nomination, yet he will do right if elected. But if Seward and company have had influence enough

heretofore to keep him silent when it was his duty to have spoken, will they not have just as much influence after his election? Will they not threaten to abandon his administration? Will he not, to secure their support, they being the great majority in his party, just as General Taylor did, determine, as a military man, to sacrifice the small body from the South? And when we are pressed again, as we doubtless shall be, what Northern man, either Whig or Democrat, will come to our relief? If we, the minority, sacrifice our friends and put in our enemies, what right have we to look for Northern support again?

But it may be said if we refuse to support General Scott, General Pierce will be elected. If he were a dangerous man, there might be force in the objection. I have closely scrutinized his course since the beginning of the canvass. Upon all questions connected with slavery and the rights of the South, no man that I know of, from any section of the Union, has a better record. While he has been, as far as I know, true to all the great essential interests of his own section, his votes and speeches prove him to have been eminently just and liberal to us. Since his retirement from Congress his course has been consistent and national. He was active in putting down, in the Democratic party of New Hampshire, John P. Hale, the Abolition candidate for the Presidency. More recently he did the same with respect to Atwood. Mr. Atwood, a political and personal friend of General Pierce, was the Democratic nominee for Governor. Shortly before the election, when there was every prospect of the success of Mr. Atwood—as his opponent, the Whig candidate, was like all the other Whigs of New Hampshire, hostile to the Fugitive Slave Law—he likewise wrote a letter expressing his opposition to that measure. General Pierce, being only then a private citizen, was under no particular obligation to interfere. He might, too, have said that both the candidates were merely standing on the same ground. Besides, neither he nor the people of New Hampshire, had any practical interest in the Fugitive Slave Law. It was there a mere question of justice to the South; and yet General Pierce took it upon himself to travel some distance to see Mr. Atwood, and on his refusal to take back his letter, he commenced a movement which resulted in degrading Atwood from his position as the Democratic candidate for Governor, and in substituting a sound man in his place. It was thus that General Pierce, a private citizen, under no especial obligation to take so much trouble and odium on himself, acted from a mere determination to do justice to the constitutional rights of the South. How does General Scott's conduct compare with it? In Pennsylvania, General Scott was nominated for the Presidency by the same Convention that nominated Governor Johnson for re-election. But Governor Johnson refused to sign a bill passed by the Democratic Legislature of Pennsylvania to facilitate the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, and was, in fact, avowedly hostile to that measure. Here, then, was a proper case for the interference of General Scott, he being associated in the nomination of the Convention with Johnson. Ought he not, in justice to himself, if he was a friend to the Compromise, to have written at least a letter vindicating his position? But, on the contrary, he was as mute as the grave, and lent

the whole weight of his military popularity to the support of Johnson. And he was repaid by the exertions of Governor Johnson, who after his defeat by the Democratic candidate, came to the Convention at Baltimore and carried his delegation for General Scott.

But it is said that we were represented in the Convention, and are therefore bound to support its nominee. Suppose it had nominated Fred Douglas, the free negro—the same argument might have been used. Should it be said that this is not a supposable case, then would we not have been bound to support Mr. Seward, who will doubtless, if the South acquiesces and assists in the election of General Scott, be the next nominee?

If we are not bound to go for any nominee unless he is a proper person, is not this the time for us to make the stand? It is, however, said that allegiance to our party requires support of its ticket. It was Decatur's motto that one's country must be supported right or wrong; but are we to do the same by a party? The independent freemen of the section from which you and I come, have not thought so. When General Jackson was first elected he did not lose two hundred votes in our congressional district. But in 1840, when his party presented Martin Van Buren as a candidate for re-election, there was a majority of four thousand four hundred votes against him. That was an exhibition of independence worthy of American freemen, who ought always to prefer the interests of their country to mere party success. If the Whig Convention has now, as I think, made, under the circumstances, an unworthy nomination ought we not to repudiate it? I do not at present see any practical issue pending between the parties of sufficient magnitude to require us to sustain the Whig nominee at all hazards. All the Whigs appear to be satisfied with Mr. Fillmore's administration. And yet, since he came into office, there has been no new measure of a party character passed. The sub-Treasury, tariff, and other general laws enacted in Mr. Polk's time, have not been changed. There is but one of them Mr. Fillmore recommended change in, viz: the tariff. With reference to that, however, the last Legislature of our own State, with unanimity both among the Whigs and Democrats, passed strong resolutions against any increase of duties. There seems in fact no reason to suppose that under Mr. Pierce, if he should come in, there would be any material change in these respects.

But it is said that the Van Burens and other Free Soilers are supporting Pierce. It must be remembered, however, that he was not nominated through their influences, but in direct opposition to them. It was the South, with the aid of the conservative Democrats of the North, that effected his nomination. These Free Soilers, therefore, being overpowered, merely for the sake of keeing in with their party, fell into the rear of the movement. But in the case of General Scott the reverse was true. He was nominated by the influence of Seward, Johnston, and other anti-slavery leaders, against the united and determined efforts of the whole South and the Compromise men of the North, and if we support him we must expect to constitute a tail to the army of Abolitionists in front. It may be said that as the Van

Burens, &c., have yielded, we ought to follow their example. But they have in reality surrendered nothing practical, because they had no interest in this question. Their anti-slavery, if not merely taken up to defeat Cass, was at least only a fancy matter, and in giving it up they have only to sacrifice some pride of consistency. We of the South, on the contrary, have a practical interest,—a great stake in the slavery question. Should we abandon it and throw ourselves into the embraces of the Abolitionists, who from the North will be able to extricate us? I pass over, sir, many grave points of objection to General Scott that have been urged by others, especially his contemptuous manner of slurring over the platform by “accepting the nomination with the resolutions annexed.” He not only fails to follow the example of General Pierce by declaring that the principles meet his approbation; but inasmuch as there was a great pressure upon him to get him up to the work, his failure is ominous. Fairly construed, his language, under all the circumstances, only seems to imply that he liked the nomination so much that he was willing to take it notwithstanding the objectionable resolutions tied on to it. So is he construed throughout the North; and he must, when he wrote the words, have felt a contempt for our understandings if he thought we could put any other construction on them. I am sorry that his supporters, instead of endeavoring to meet these issues, are merely striving to get up an excitement in relation to his military services by the exhibition of pictures, &c. Brilliant military services, like his, are a great feature in the cap of any man; but our people have not deemed them alone sufficient to qualify one for the Presidential office, in despite of great political objections.

I make no reference to the personal charges against the candidates because they are unnecessarily and most unworthily made. Having known General Scott for a great many years, it gives me pleasure to testify to his high moral worth and honorable qualities as a soldier and a man. Though I have never seen General Pierce, yet all of those who served with him in Mexico, that I have met, concur in saying that no man there was more respected or more popular. The intelligence, courage, and high tone of that army forbid the idea that they would have held General Pierce in the estimation they did, if he had been deficient in any manly or honorable quality. Those politicians, too, who have served with him in either House of Congress, as far as I have heard them speak, have expressed themselves invariably in the most favorable terms with respect to him.

I am well aware, sir, that the expression of these opinions may subject me to denunciation from some. If I had consulted only my personal convenience, I might well have fallen into the general current of the party. Not having in any way committed myself against General Scott prior to his nomination, I might have claimed credit as an early supporter, and occupied, doubtless, a position in the front of his party. But had I done so, I would not have acted in accordance with my own sense of right. I have too often encountered opposition in the conscientious discharge of my duty to hesitate now.

If Franklin Pierce was willing to encounter a storm of opposition and obloquy by opposing the strong Abolition current of the North, as he did in putting down Atwood, merely to sustain the rights of a distant section of the Union, ought not you and I, and others, to be willing to make some sacrifices, if necessary, to maintain the great essential interests of our own section? When General Scott received the nomination, was it not the general feeling of our people that he ought not to be supported? That was an honest, patriotic impulse. Under pressing solicitations and the influence of party prejudice many have reluctantly yielded acquiescence. Is it not better, however, to consider the matter calmly and act solely for the interest of the country? If General Scott should be elected, under all existing circumstances, it not only consigns to their political graves forever, Messrs. Fillmore and Webster, and other Compromise Whigs of the North; but the defeat of General Pierce will tend powerfully to deter any Northern Democrat from again standing up for our rights. This is what Seward and his followers are evidently seeking to accomplish. Ought we to aid them in such a movement, intended as it is solely to effect our political and social destruction? Is it not, under all the circumstances, better that Franklin Pierce should be elected rather than General Scott? By repudiating the nomination of the latter, by making it manifest that he was beaten, not merely because the Democratic party was the strongest, but because also the conservative men of the country generally refused to support him, we may prevent the recurrence of a similar nomination by any future convention, and greatly contribute to ensure the future quiet of the country.

I am, very respectfully, yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

To show more fully the circumstances and arguments which led to the disastrous defeat incurred by General Scott, and which in fact terminated the existence as a national organization of the old Whig party, the following address to my constituents is republished. The first part of it is devoted to the summing up of the objections to General Scott, but there is in it a good deal of matter that is local or personal, which is omitted.

WASHINGTON, January 12, 1853.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: In the short interval which elapsed between the close of the last and the commencement of the present session of Congress, I did not, in consequence of my being unwell for some weeks, find time to visit all the counties of our district; I determined, therefore, to avail myself of the first leisure time to address you in explanation of my views, and to defend myself against attacks. This I regarded as alike due to myself, whether I should or should not again be a candidate before you. That is a question which can be decided with more propriety at the close of my present term of service, than it could at an earlier day. Valuing as I do my character as a man, and reputation as a statesman, more than mere political success, I shall leave all considerations only connected with the latter to a future day.

For several years past old party topics have been lost sight of, and overridden entirely by questions connected with the institution of slavery. Though for a great while abolition societies have been active in the Northern States, yet the agitation did not assume a formidable shape until within the last half-dozen years. During the Mexican war, there being a prospect that territory would be acquired, the Wilmot proviso was brought forward. The effect of that movement was to provide that in whatever territory we might acquire, no slaveholder should settle with his property. By this means the territory would be carved into free States, and by its political affinities strengthen the North. This was the main object of Northern politicians. They intended that while no more slave States should be admitted into the Union, a number of free States might come in, so as to give them the entire control, in a few years, of the government. It was their purpose not only to secure thus all the political power of the Union, but in the end to effect the abolition of slavery, or the passage of measures destructive to our interests. On our part we resisted this state of things, not only because of its mischievous tendency, but also on account of its gross injustice. The Southern States besides paying a liberal proportion of the taxes necessary to sustain the war, actually furnished twice as many soldiers as the North. As our population was in fact but little more than half theirs, we thus contributed, proportionally, four times as much as their section. Feeling indignant at the attempt to exclude us entirely, we struggled to effect either such a settlement as might leave the territory open to every citizen of the Republic, so that he could go into it with such property as he could hold at home, or at least to get some equitable division. Most Southern men were willing to take the Missouri line as a compromise, though it would have given us only one third of the territory acquired.

The Congress in which this measure was introduced, passed by without any final action. When the next Congress assembled in December, 1847, the subject was renewed. I found that every single Whig from the free States, and a large portion of the Democrats likewise, steadily supported, on every division, the principle of the Wilmot proviso. When, feeling indignant at such palpable injustice, we remonstrated with Northern Whigs, we were often told not to be alarmed, that they only intended to use this question as a means of stopping the Mexican war, and of splitting into two the Democratic party in New York, who were divided on the question. They declared, from time to time, that they did not intend to push the matter to a practical issue, and that we need feel no alarm whatever. They assured us, most emphatically, that they intended to take no ground in the end that would oblige Southern Whigs to abandon them. On the side of the Democrats there were many against us likewise, and General Cass, the head of the party, occupied in his Nicholson letter, a position unsatisfactory to us, and which, subsequently was repudiated also by the bulk of his party in the South. General Taylor, our candidate, took no position whatever on this subject, but we preferred risking the chances with him, to one whose doctrine was objectionable. The first attempt at settlement which came near succeeding was that known as the Clay-

ton Compromise. This measure was bitterly opposed by every Northern Whig in the House of Representatives. They declared that it was, in its tendency merely calculated to elect Cass, and that if it were defeated, they would afterwards give us a better settlement, &c. I do not suppose that any Southern Whig was induced to take ground against the bill on the strength of these assurances alone, though it is probable that such promises operated in aid of other objections. In fact, it is due to the eight gentlemen from the South who assisted in defeating the measure, that I should say that though I did not act with them, yet I concurred in the opinion that this bill fell far short of doing the South justice. These gentlemen, and all of us from that section, in fact, had a right to look for a better adjustment. I am sorry to be obliged to say, however, that after the termination of the Presidential contest, there were no more favorable indications on the part of our Northern political allies. At the following session, commencing in December, 1848, they not only voted regularly for the Wilmot proviso, to exclude us from all share in the conquered territory, but when Mr. Gott's resolution was passed for the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, they were found voting for it. There was, as you well know, fellow-citizens, a meeting of the Southern members of Congress to devise means to protect their section. We were then met by the same sort of solicitation on the part of Northern men, and such Southern Whigs as sympathized with them. They declared that this movement was all a scheme of certain Democrats to break down General Taylor's administration before it came into power, and implored us to take no rash steps, but to trust to their good conduct at the proper time. Though I attached, myself, no weight to these declarations, yet I am satisfied that they served to sooth and quiet many Southern members. At the close of the session there was another vigorous effort to settle the territorial question. I allude to Walker's amendment, a proposition of a Democratic Senator, which came to us from the other wing of the Capitol, where it had been adopted by a handsome vote. This was, in my judgment, a better settlement for the South than the Clayton Compromise, and all the Southern members made an honest effort to pass it. It met, however, the same kind of opposition from the body of the Northern Whigs, and a portion of the Democrats, and was defeated, as all similar movements had been.

General Taylor's administration then came into power, and for myself, I felt that we had a right to require of the Northern Whigs some national and liberal line of policy as the price of any further co-operation in party movements. In the autumn of 1849, before the assembling of the new Congress, while traveling in the Northern States, I had opportunities for ascertaining something of the sentiment in that section. I found, as was admitted in our first caucus during the discussion of Mr. Toombs' resolution, that every Whig member of Congress from the free States had, prior to his election, during the canvass, been pledged to the support of the Wilmot proviso, and to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. This had been done generally in the nominating conventions to enable them to beat the Cass men in some localities, who stood on his non-intervention plat-

form, and also to win over the Abolition voters from the support of Van Buren or Hale. They were thus all pledged to a line of policy, in fact unconstitutional and destructive to the government. A portion of the Democratic members elect, also, stood upon the same principles, while many even of the non-intervention men, irritated by their defeat, had determined, with a view of punishing the South, to offer no resistance to these measures, but to oblige General Taylor to sign or veto the bills. Seeing that almost the entire North was hostile—on my reaching the city early in November, I made such inquiries as were necessary to ascertain what were the views of the administration, and whether it was likely to make any affective resistance to this hostile line of policy. A majority of the cabinet were Wilmot proviso men, while part of the minority were indifferent. I came soon to the conclusion, from all the information that I could obtain, that if the proviso were passed, it would not be vetoed; while, with respect to the abolition of slavery in the District, I could not learn that anything was determined on except to avoid the issue if possible. Seeing the dangers that threatened my section, I expressed my apprehensions to my colleague, Mr. Mangum, and to General Foote, of Mississippi, both of whom happened to be here at that time. Our letters then published were intended to put our countrymen on their guard, and prepare them for the struggle. When Congress assembled, it is well-known that the manifestations were such as to excite alarm in the country. Several weeks elapsed before the organization of the House was completed. Though some little impression had been made by our efforts, yet it appeared that a majority of about twenty votes were still for the Wilmot proviso, as indicated by the division on a proposition introduced by Mr. Root, of Ohio. Happening to obtain the floor at the opening of the debate on the President's Message, I, in my speech of the twenty-second of January, 1850, after surveying the ground which the Northern Whigs had occupied to a man in the preceding Congress, declared, most emphatically, that the time for a change in their line of policy had come, if they looked for further co-operation from our section. The first favorable indication occurred a few days afterwards, when the proposition of Mr. Root, coming up for final action, was defeated by a vote of the House. The incidents of that memorable session are too well known to require a review of them. After General Taylor's death, and the accession of Mr. Fillmore, the bills commonly called the Compromise Measures became laws. Being unwilling that the South should lose all the territory acquired from Mexico, I refused to vote for the bills disposing of it. The Fugitive Slave Law being the compensation offered us for the other measures, I supported, because right in itself. As the Constitution had already provided that fugitives should be delivered to their owners, I was not willing for the sake of getting a new law on that subject, to consent to surrender to the North the whole of that territory, it being sufficient to make ten States as large as North Carolina. When, however, those measures had passed irrevocably, though the bargain had in my opinion been an unwise one for us, yet I resolved to insist upon the North carrying out the Fugitive Slave Law which

they had offered us in exchange for the territory given up to them, and which could not of course be gotten back.

It ought not be forgotten, too, that even after they obtained the admission of California, and the passage of the other territorial measures, out of more than eighty Whig members of Congress from the North, only three were willing to vote for the Fugitive Slave law, its enactment being mainly due to the support of the Northern Democracy and Southern members generally. The great body of the Northern Whigs still stood upon their anti-slavery ground. They still constituted a formidable band, hostile to our section, determined to use all the powers within their reach for our injury, anxious to convert a government formed for our protection into an engine of oppression, and to substitute for the limited Constitution of the United States a political system, that, in all time was to be our great enemy. Though repulsed and foiled in their efforts, they did not feel discomfited, and were intent on recovering the vantage ground, which they had for a time lost. For myself, having already met trouble and difficulty enough from their efforts, I determined not to give them aid, but, on the contrary, to use my best exertions to prevent their getting into power again, until they abandoned those principles. Their first movement was the opening of a fierce war on those Northern men who had shown a disposition to do us justice, and had aided in the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act. It was their purpose to render such persons odious throughout the entire North, and build up, on their destruction, a controlling political party. A part of their plan consisted in superseding such men as Fillmore and Webster with a presidential candidate of hostile views. Their thoughts were at once turned to General Scott, who, in accordance with their wishes, avoided committing himself, publicly, in relation to any of the so-called compromise measures. Though urged again and again by Southern men to take a position, by letter or speech, he steadily refused to do it. It is known to you fellow citizens, that, in 1848, I advocated his claims rather than General Taylor's. I need not recapitulate my reasons for so doing it this time. Though neither he nor General Taylor had taken any distinct ground upon the slavery question as then pending, yet for party reasons I preferred General Scott to General Taylor, who had not been connected in any way with the action of the Whig party.

Soon after that contest, however, viz: in the summer of 1849, General Scott published his Canada letter, in which, while expressing his wish for the annexation of the British provinces, he went out of his way to declare his hostility to the acquisition of Mexican territory. This occurred in the height of the controversy about the territory already acquired. It was, in substance, saying to the North, I am for strengthening you, but against the South. It must not be forgotten that the British possessions are larger than the whole United States, and yet while in favor of obtaining them he was against Southern acquisition, lest we might likewise be strengthened so as to be able to resist the North. If he had in express terms declared for the Wilmot proviso, he could not have exhibited himself as more sectional or more hostile

to us. The great object of the freesoilers was, as you know, to prevent in the first place the extension of slavery, so that the number of slaves might after a time become so great as to force their emancipation, and, secondly, by the admission of a great many free States, in succession, to get power enough to bring the action of the Federal government to bear directly on our section. We, on the other hand, struggled to get a part at least of the conquered territory, so as to have a place to carry off the increase of our slaves, and prevent that social destruction which a general emancipation would produce. We also felt it right that we too should, by the admission of new slave States, have power enough to defend ourselves in the government without being driven to a revolution. During this struggle on our part for right and justice, General Scott threw his weight into the scale against us. He was thus in the best position to be taken up by the anti-slavery party as its candidate, and they, therefore, rallied with great zeal and unanimity to his support. With a view of counteracting this movement on their part, I prepared, for the consideration of the Congressional caucus, the following resolution, which was published in the Washington City papers of the 24th of April, five days after the meeting of the caucus:

“WHEREAS, By the series of measures commonly called the Compromise, California has been admitted into the Union as a State, the boundary of Texas has been settled, territorial governments have been established for Utah and New Mexico, and the slave trade in the District of Columbia has been abolished, and these several measures have been acquiesced in and carried into effect; and whereas resistance has been made in certain places to the execution of the Fugitive Slave law, and efforts are being made to effect its repeal, or render negative and null its provisions; therefore

“*Resolved*, That in view of these things, and inasmuch as, under the Constitution of the United States, we are entitled to an efficient Fugitive Slave law, that we have a right to require that this latter law shall be sustained and carried out in good faith, and that any national convention nominating a presidential candidate shall, in unequivocal and plain language, declare it to be the purpose of said convention faithfully to carry out this law, and that its nominee shall express his concurrence in such a proposition.”

Though at this time my proposition was regarded as an extreme one, yet before the convention assembled in the following June, such was seen to be the state of opinion in the Southern country, that the supporters of General Scott, contrary to their original intention, found themselves obliged to adopt a resolution endorsing the Fugitive Slave law. I required more, however, than this, viz: not only that the “convention should declare it to be its purpose faithfully to carry out this law,” but also “that its nominee should express his concurrence in such a proposition.” In other words, I required that General Scott, after his nomination, should in the words of my resolution “in unequivocal and plain language, declare it to be his purpose faithfully to carry out this law.” This, however, he, after his nomination, took especial pains to avoid doing. His letter was so evasive and equivocal in its terms, as to make it manifest that he intended to give no such pledge. He “accepted the nomination with the resolutions annexed,”

implying only that he liked the nomination so much that he took it notwithstanding the objectionable resolutions fastened to it. Instead of saying in "unequivocal and plain language," that he would carry out this law, he only referred to the past incidents of his life, which were very equivocal, or rather adverse to the carrying out of these principles.

I saw at once, on reading his letter, that he had not the slightest claims on me for support. While advocating the adoption of my resolution, in my remarks, published at the time referred to, I used the following language:

"I say, then, that I cannot support the pending proposition to fix the time and place for holding a national convention. I will not in any mode give my sanction to the calling of such a convention unconditionally. If I were to do so, I should feel myself bound in honor to support its nominee. I am, therefore, willing to join in calling it only on conditions such as are expressed in part by my resolution. I am willing that those gentlemen who desire to do so shall hold a convention and present a nominee; but I shall then decide for myself whether I vote for that nominee or not. I mean to say that I shall not support the individual merely because he has been nominated by that convention.

"The nomination will neither help nor hurt the person selected, in my judgment. I wish, therefore, to be understood as neither advocating nor opposing the calling of this convention, and do not mean to be bound by its action to go further than my sense of duty may prompt. I shall hereafter, upon a full view of all the circumstances, determine what I ought to do."

You will thus see, fellow-citizens, that I, in view of all the difficulties of the position of things, left myself free to adopt whatever line of action a sense of duty might afterwards prompt me to take. Being in no respect bound by the action of the convention, I was just in the situation after it had acted that I had been in before it assembled. But before that convention acted, was not the whole South opposed to General Scott? Who, I repeat, in our section was then for him? If others felt bound to surrender their convictions to the decision of the convention, I at least did not so feel, having reserved the right to accept or reject the nominee, as might best comport with my sense of duty. If the whole people of the South had like myself kept out of the convention, how many would have gone for Scott? I appeal to you all to say if, prior to his nomination, it was not the general feeling that he ought not to be brought forward or supported.

On the appearance of General Scott's letter of acceptance, having thus waited to the last moment to allow him to set himself right on these great issues, I proposed to my colleagues, Messrs. Outlaw and Caldwell, that we should join in a publication, stating the grounds of our opposition to him. This proposal was subsequently, on several occasions, renewed to them. On their declining it, I resolved to postpone any publication on my part until I reached North Carolina, so as to be ready, before my constituents, to repel such attacks as I foresaw would be made on me. This determination was communicated to many. My colleague, Mr. Caldwell, remembers, that on the last

day of the session when we shook hands, I authorized him to say that I should not only take the field in my district against General Scott, but that my reasons should also be published a sufficient time before the election to enable everybody to understand them. I may add that my opposition to General Scott was so constantly and publicly stated in conversations, that I have no reason to suppose that any member of Congress was ignorant of it. I also had occasion, in answer to letters received, to write to that effect to many persons of both political parties in different parts of the State prior to our last August election.

But, fellow-citizens, I had still other objections to the support of General Scott. He declares in his letter of acceptance that he will "neither countenance nor tolerate any sedition, disorder faction or resistance to the law or the Union, on any pretext, in any part of the land." This declaration is so broad and so strange, that we might, perhaps, regard it as a rhetorical flourish were it not part of a well-considered and carefully prepared paper. It is inconsistent with every notion of the limitations of our constitutional system of government, and at war with every principle of the old Republican party. Mr. Webster, formerly identified with the Federal party, and noted for his efforts to strengthen the Government, nevertheless declared in a public address within the last two years, that if the North should break the bargain on its side, and fail to deliver up fugitives, that then the South would be released. Mr. Clay, whose "*unionism*" was never questioned, said in his speech to the Legislature of Kentucky, that if the government should attack the institution of slavery in the States, then he was for going out of the Union. The Union men of the South have everywhere gone much further than this, and have boldly proclaimed, that if the late Compromise was violated materially, or even if the fugitive slave law should be repealed, they would sever every tie that bound them to the Union. This, you know, was the doctrine of the men most opposed to me in the last contest. It was, in truth, the universal doctrine of the South. In fact, no party, standing on different ground, could have lived for a month in any one of the Southern States. And yet General Scott, in the most decided terms, repudiates everything like this principle. In substance he says to the Union party of the South, that even if the fugitive slave law should be repealed, and you resist in any mode that repealing law, you shall be put down by force.

To Mr. Webster he says, though the North should break the bargain on its part, yet I will compel the South to submit to that wrong, and hold you guilty of treason for advising differently. And when the majority of Congress have gone on and abolished slavery in the States, and put the negro on an equal footing with the white man, if Mr. Clay should call on his countrymen to protect their rights and liberty, he is to be executed as a traitor, because he resists the "law or the Union" upon such a "*pretext*." This declaration of General Scott's is but a repetition of the old doctrine of submission to the divinity of rulers and governments. It is a doctrine which perished on the American continent on the fourth of July, 1776. It is not even recog-

nized in the limited monarchies of Europe, though it still maintains its sway under the despotisms of Asia. Why was General Scott induced to incorporate such sentiments in his letter, at war as they are with all the principles of the Republican party, and in fact with all just American notions? Those who advised him to it must have had a motive. There are, it is true, many persons scattered up and down the country, who, of extreme Federal opinions, are at all times struggling to have the present Constitution of the United States converted, practically, into an absolute government. More than their efforts, however, must have been at work. Is it not to be traced to the influence of the anti-slavery party of the North? These higher law men are struggling to obliterate all the limitations of the Constitution, and to absorb within the vortex of the Federal government all the rights of the States and the people. In this mode they hope to oppress the minority in the South, and carry out their purposes. Expecting themselves to have the control of the Government, they inculcate the doctrine of unconditional submission to whatever the majority of Congress may do. They have, with these objects, therefore, artfully contrived to have such a sentiment incorporated in this letter, so that if General Scott had been elected they might have declared that the American people had sanctioned it, and thus greatly contributed to give it currency and strength.

If, then, fellow-citizens, General Scott had been elected, what would have been the actual condition of things? In the first place, Messrs. Fillmore and Webster had been superseded in the convention, because of their support of the Compromise and the Fugitive Slave Law, and General Scott's election would have been regarded as evidence that the people approved the conduct of the Convention. It would also have been a condemnation of General Pierce, who had planted himself firmly on the same ground. The friends of the Compromise, of the Constitution, and of the South, would have been defeated, trodden under foot, and politically buried. The anti-slavery party, headed by Mr. Seward, would have been triumphant. They would then have been the men of the day, and in "high feather," flushed with conquest, they would have taken possession of the government. They would, too, have claimed that the people had endorsed their consolidation doctrines, and thereby agreed to submit to whatever the government might choose to do. If any man supposes that, under these circumstances, they would not soon have been able to do mischief, then he is ignorant of the occurrences of the last few years. With the experience which I have had here, if I had aided them, I should have been faithless to your interests.

It is my settled opinion, that if all the facts within my knowledge had been known to you generally, that General Scott would not have obtained five hundred votes in our district. But I attach no blame whatever to those who supported him. On the contrary, I have said that if I had been at home with no other means of information than the newspapers afforded, I might have been deceived possibly, and induced to sustain General Scott. So destitute of fairness and truth are a great many of the newspapers of the day, that it is impossible

frequently for men, however honest or intelligent, to ascertain the real condition of things. For example, suppose that during the last contest for Congress in our district, an individual living at a distance had had no other means of arriving at the facts than such as the reading of the *Messenger*, the organ of my opponents, afforded him, he would very naturally have supposed that I was not only the worst and most dangerous man in the whole country, but also that I was the most unpopular, and would be the worst beaten man ever seen. Such a person would have been utterly amazed to learn, after the election, that I had carried a majority of every county and of almost every voting precinct.

Similar misrepresentations have been made with reference to the late presidential contest, and it is no wonder that honest and intelligent men were everywhere misled. I took no part in misleading you, but on the contrary gave you all frankly my views not only in relation to the principles involved, but also as to the result. In my conversations and public speeches up to the very time of the election, I expressed the opinion that General Scott would not only be beaten by a larger vote than Van Buren was in 1840, but that he would only get three or four States. Some of his supporters, however, to break the overwhelming blow that has fallen on them, assert that General Pierce got all the Abolitionists of the North, and was thus so successful. The facts, however, do not bear out such an allegation. On the contrary, in those sections where the abolition feeling is strongest, General Scott made the best run. It was on the contrary where there is most conservative and liberal feeling, that Pierce made the greatest gains. He had a majority in the city of Boston, where the Whig candidates have usually carried the day by several thousands. This city was the residence of one of the three Northern Whigs who voted for the Fugitive Slave law, and it was here that Mr. Webster's influence was greatest. In like manner in the conservative cities of New York and Philadelphia there were gains of some ten or fifteen thousand votes to the Democratic candidate; and as a general fact it may be stated that in those sections of the country where there was least anti-slavery feeling, General Scott ran farthest behind the usual Whig strength. Why even in our congressional district, where there were twelve thousand votes cast in August last, he received only four thousand six hundred, or but little over one-third. In the preceding presidential contest, the Whig candidate obtained more than four thousand majority, nearly as much as General Scott's whole vote. And you will bear me witness that those who voted for him, with but few exceptions, did it reluctantly, and from a disposition to support their party nominee, against one of whom they knew little. That the great body of General Scott's supporters were actuated by the best and most patriotic motives no one can question, and a clearer understanding of his position would have induced them to abandon him. A few persons have shown a disposition to blame me because I did not, in opposition to my knowledge of the facts, fall in and support him out of deference to the general feeling of the party, that did not take the same view. As, however, I had been placed in a position to get a better knowledge of the

issues involved than many others, I should have been false to the trust reposed in me if I had so done. If a sentinel on the watch tower should perceive peril in the distance, which was unknown to his comrades in the camp, ought he to seem to be ignorant of its approach because his fellows were so; or is it not his duty to give them warning? Again, suppose you had employed me to manage an important law suit, to be tried in a distant court, and had advised me of your wishes as to the mode of the prosecution, and suppose that after reaching the place I should find upon a full understanding of all the facts of which in part you had not been apprised, that if I acted in accordance with your impressions, I should lose the case, but that I could gain it by taking a different course, ought I to pretend to be ignorant for the sake of acting in accordance with your suggestions, and thus lose the case, or gain it by taking such steps as you would yourself have directed if present, and acquainted with the facts? Ought I not to obtain a judgment for you? In the present instance, I stand upon this position. In the emergency just passed, the best result attainable has been reached. The defeat of General Scott, under the existing circumstances, accomplishes more to repress abolitionism, and advance sound republican principles, and a proper regard for the limitations of the Constitution, than any event in our time.

The subject of the tariff has occupied a good deal of the public attention within the last few years. In September of 1850, a proposition to raise the scale of duty was brought forward by Mr. Vinton, of Ohio. While the increase was large on all things, it would have been particularly onerous on Iron. The tax on railroad bar would have been more than doubled, and the cost of the iron for the roads that North Carolina was then constructing would have been increased about five hundred thousand dollars. Nevertheless, the proposition came within a vote or two of being adopted. I opposed it with one other Whig member, viz: my colleague, the Hon. Joseph P. Caldwell.

On that occasion we were denounced for going against the rest of our party, and the organ of the manufacturers in this city, and other papers of the same stamp, called upon the people of North Carolina to read us a lesson. Unfortunately, however, for their wishes, when the Legislature met the next winter, it passed, with unexpected unanimity, resolutions fully sustaining us, and protesting against any increase of protection to the mining and manufacturing interest. In the February following, on the floor of the House, while defending this line of policy, I went further and took ground for a repeal of the existing duty on railroad iron, and since then I have on all proper occasions continued to offer arguments in support of that view. Instead of being censured by my constituents, as those interested in the continuance of the tax have desired, I have the satisfaction of knowing that our Legislature, at its session recently closed, has passed, without a dissenting voice, a resolution in favor of making all railroad iron free of duty. Such, too, has been the progress of public opinion in this direction, that a proposition has been introduced at the present session by a Northern Whig member, (Mr. Brooks, of New York,) in the following words:

“Except so much of the message as relates to the tariff and revenue from customs, which shall be referred to a select committee, with power to examine witnesses and to collect testimony here and elsewhere; and with instructions to report as soon as possible upon the same, with a bill reducing the duties on imports to such an amount as may be required for an economical administration of the government.”

Here is a proposition to *reduce* the duties, thereby admitting that they are at present too high, and yet it received the sanction of my colleagues, and was even voted for by every Whig in the House, with the exception of some seven or eight. Upon this question, therefore, though denounced two years since for my course, I have been fully vindicated by the progress of events.

* * * * *

Respectfully, your friend and fellow-citizen,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

[After the overwhelming defeat of General Scott, there seemed to be quite a lull in the slavery agitation. The people of the North generally saw that their section had gained substantially what was most important by the compromise measures, and the politicians found that there was nothing to be made by further agitation at that time. The Abolitionists, however, did not relax their efforts to keep the country excited, and prosecuted industriously their efforts to carry away slaves, and to excite mob violence to prevent their return under the fugitive slave act.]

The calm did not endure long, and, in fact, only needed some practical issue to revive the storm with increased violence. An occasion was soon presented by the “Nebraska bill.” During the session of 1852 and 1853, a bill came up in the House to create a new Territory west of the State of Missouri. A running debate sprang up, chiefly with reference to its interfering with the rights of the Indians in that territory. In fact, however, some Southern members, feeling that their section had not been well treated in the compromise measures, were reluctant to admit additional free Territories, and thus increase the preponderance of the North in Congress. This feeling was felt rather than expressed in words. During the progress of the debate, the Hon. David K. Cartter, then a Democratic member from Ohio, came across to my seat and said, “It seems to me that we are likely to get up the old excitement of the former times, and I am sorry to see it, for we have of late been getting on pleasantly.” I answered that I had seen the same tendency, and was looking for an opportunity to stop the debate. Immediately thereafter I wrote and offered an amendment to cover the case and protect the rights of the Indians, which was adopted, (it was the same clause precisely which afterwards appeared in the bill that passed at the next session). This amendment was immediately accepted, and the bill was passed. It was, however, defeated in the Senate by the efforts chiefly of Senator Atchison, of Missouri.

At the succeeding session of Congress, the proposition was brought up again by Mr. Douglass, in the Senate, he being then chairman of the committee on Territories.

As first presented, the bill did not provide in its terms for the abrogation of the old Missouri restriction of slavery to the line of 36 degrees, 30 minutes. A desire, however, was expressed by many for its repeal, because it was inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention established by the compromise of 1850. Of course Southern members were generally desirous of the repeal of the line of 36 degrees, 30 minutes, but many doubted as to its policy, lest our friends in the North might thereby be weakened. For a time General Cass and Judge Douglass appeared to be undecided as to what ought to be done.

While the matter was under consideration, President Pierce one day when we were casually together, referring to the matter, said: "The granite Democracy of New Hampshire would like for such an issue to be presented, just to see how easily they would carry it." A circumstance had occurred a few months previous which I then thought had some influence in causing him to desire that such an issue should be raised.

The letter which Secretary Guthrie had written to Bronson, in New York, instructing him, while distributing the subordinate offices in the custom-house, in New York, to bestow part of them on the "free soil" or Van Buren wing of the party, had been published. As Bronson had been removed for not complying with these instructions, the "hard-shell" Democrats of the State were indignant, and their papers as well as the opposition press of the country, assailed the administration fiercely. As President Pierce had always been liberal to the South, and had been elected on high grounds of opposition to the abolition movement, he was evidently worried by these attacks.

It struck me that he was especially desirous of an opportunity to show his hostility to the anti-slavery party. Hence when a number of the prominent Democratic Senators went down one evening to consult him, he favored the movement and gave assurances of administrative support.

The action of Senator Dixon, of Kentucky, seemed to complicate the question. He offered an amendment to the bill providing in express terms for the repeal of the line of 36 degrees, 30 minutes. One evening after his amendment had been offered, though myself desirous of the repeal, yet doubting as to its policy, I called to see him, and found him and Senator James C. Jones, of Tennessee, together. On my stating that I feared that his movement might merely embarrass some of our friends in the North, and cause them to be defeated by Free soilers or Abolitionists, he declared that he meant to press it because it was right in itself, and that he did not intend, after non-intervention had been adopted, to yield further to the wishes of the Northern Whigs. Mr. Jones was equally decided in his views. It was apparent that they, in common with many Southern Whigs, felt that they had, by too much yielding to the views of the Northern portion of the party, not only weakened themselves at home, but in fact contributed to place their own section in jeopardy. It thus happened that the measure to repeal the Missouri compromise line, was not only acceptable to the majority of the Democratic party, but was also favored by a large portion of the Southern Whigs, who felt that consistency to their past action, and a proper regard for their own manhood, required them to insist that the policy which had been adopted in 1850 should be carried out on all subsequent occasions.

Though I had not been originally a supporter of this policy, yet to aid its friends then, I made the following speech:]

SPEECH

ON NEBRASKA AND KANSAS, DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 4, 1854.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. CLINGMAN said:

MR. CHAIRMAN: As no one has had the floor assigned to him, I will now occupy it with a view of saying something upon a question which has been already discussed at great length during the present session of Congress.

I have heretofore sought an opportunity to present to this House certain points connected with the Nebraska bill. It is probable that I shall find an hour little time enough for my purpose, and therefore I say to the gentlemen around me that I hope they will not interrupt me by asking permission to explain. I shall endeavor to do justice to every one, but should it be my misfortune to misrepresent any gentleman with whose opinions I may come in collision, I hope that he will avail himself of some other occasion to correct me. It has never been my misfortune, while I have occupied a seat upon this floor, to make a single remark that any gentleman in the House thought offensive to him, nor have I ever been called upon to explain anything I have said in the course of debate. My purpose will be to-day to keep within due parliamentary bounds, and at the same time frankly and fairly to discuss the questions connected with this subject, upon what I understand to be their true merits.

You have been told by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Millson) that I had something to say upon the Nebraska territorial bill in the last Congress, when it was pending, not in the shape, however, in which it is now presented. After a speech on it, I offered an amendment, to protect the rights of the Indians, which was adopted, and I then voted for the bill. That amendment now stands in the present bill in the identical language in which it was offered by me. The fact that more than two-thirds of that Congress thought that a territorial organization was then necessary affords an additional reason, to my mind, why we should at once organize a Territory there. I voted for the bill then—not liking it, however, and after trying to get it in a better shape—because there was nothing offensive in the bill itself. I greatly prefer the proposition which has come from the Senate. I could well support it as it is; but I shall vote, nevertheless, to strike out what is known as the Clayton amendment; not that I think it is wrong in theory, but because it will lead to no practical results, and was moved by an enemy of the bill merely to embarrass its friends in the North. As to the amendment of my colleague, (Senator Badger) I do not think that it changes the character of the original bill in any manner whatsoever. Be that as it may, as the bill now stands, it provides, in the clearest terms, that the people of that Territory shall not be prohibited, by any law formerly existing, from legislating as the Constitution of the United

States permits them to do. It does not say that there shall be no law upon the subject of slavery. It merely says that it will not REVIVE any former old law prohibiting or establishing it. In other words, that it will leave this Territory just as though there had never been in it any law upon the subject of slavery.

This, in my judgment, is the best species of non-intervention. We say that the people of the territory may legislate as the Constitution of the United States permits them to do, without the intervention of Congressional law, French law, Spanish law, Mexican law, or Indian law. It makes the Territory like a sheet of blank paper, on which our citizens may write American constitutional law. It is, therefore, a better bill than the Utah and New Mexico bills of 1850; because those bills left the Mexican laws in force, by which slavery had been abolished and prohibited. It is a better bill than the Clayton compromise; because that compromise left those Mexican laws in force; and yet every Southern Democrat in both Houses of Congress, including Mr. Calhoun, supported that measure under the idea that the Constitution of the United States, *proprio vigore*, would override, annul, and supersede those local laws. If they were right in this view, why then the more certainly would that Constitution be sufficient where there was no opposing law whatever. I am satisfied that if the Clayton compromise and the acts of 1850 had contained a repeal of the Mexican law, there would have been no opposition to them from the South. I say, then, with the utmost confidence, that the Kansas and Nebraska bills are, for the South, the best measures yet presented.

I shall not stop to answer the ingenious speech of the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Millson,) or that of the gentleman from Maryland, (Mr. Franklin.) The points argued by them were very much discussed six or seven years ago, by those of us who were then in Congress. I will only say that the real question to be met is this: "Shall this territory be left open to every citizen of the United States, with the Constitution alone to control him, or shall the Wilmot proviso stand on it?" That is the point which gentlemen have to meet. They have to show to their constituencies, that the Wilmot proviso, now standing upon and controlling the territory, is better than having it open to everybody, whether from the South or the North. I leave gentlemen to make the explanation to their constituents as they best can. It is enough for me to say that the arguments and excuses given by them are not, in my opinion, of the smallest weight to justify opposition to the bill.

But, sir, before noticing what I regard as the principal difficulty in the way, let me advert to one other striking point. I know that in 1850 certain persons professed to be in favor of non-intervention who were really opposed to that principle. The true friends of the system—those who had sustained the doctrine of General Cass—are, I have no doubt, willing to carry it out to-day. But there were certain persons at that time entirely adverse to the principle in fact, but who, nevertheless, then gave it a hypocritical support, because they said that the settlement at that time, as proposed on non-intervention grounds, would operate injuriously to the Southern section. They

saw that it let in the whole of California down to the 32d° of north latitude as a free State, and that it threw the Sante Fe country out of Texas, a slave State, into New Mexico, a territory where the Mexican law had abolished slavery, and, in the opinion of Mr. Webster, Mr. Clay, and many other prominent men, was still in full force, and sufficient to keep out slavery : and also that the people there were, as foreigners, understood to be hostile to the establishment of slavery in any way. In short, that, as these prominent gentlemen said, the North got the territory practically, while we of the South got only the principle of non-intervention for the future. This principle, highly valuable in itself, they did not intend to apply to the organization of other territories. The conduct of these persons shows that they did not, in good faith, intend to adopt the system as a general one. Hence, when afterwards this was declared to be a settlement in "*principle and substance*," by Mr. Fillmore and the National Convention, these persons only *pretended* to agree to the declaration. Their conduct now shows their insincerity, and the hollowness of their professions.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is sometimes said by gentlemen that this Missouri compromise was originally advantageous to the South, and that now, when it has ceased to be so, we want to get clear of it. Let us look at this statement for one moment.

Missouri and Arkansas were admitted as slave States. Their extent was one hundred and seventeen thousand square miles. But, on the other hand, Iowa was admitted as a free State, and Minnesota was organized as a Territory, also with a restriction or prohibition of slavery. So also were Oregon and Washington. Now, sir, these three Territories and that State contain five hundred and thirty-four thousand square miles in their area—nearly five times as much as the States of Missouri and Arkansas. Remember, too, that all this had been originally slave territory up to the date of the Missouri restriction. It appears, therefore, that while this policy of division was enforced by the Missouri line, the Northern section of the country acquired five times as much territory as the Southern. Minnesota and Iowa alone have nearly twice the extent of the two slave States of Missouri and Arkansas, and Washington and Oregon have three times as much more. It must also be borne in mind that Mr. Buchanan, as Secretary of State, claimed, in the controversy with Great Britain, the Oregon territory, as well under the French and Spanish cessions, as by the right of discovery.

As to how our title to it really accrued is not, however, material; because, under the policy of division by the Missouri line, this whole territory was given up by the South without a struggle, because it lay north of that line, and organized with the principle of restriction embodied in it. It thus will be seen that the North obtained five times as much of this territory as the South, while the policy of division was adhered to. But when the Mexican territory was acquired, by running out this same line, the South would have fared better, and gotten, in fact, more than one-third of the territory. The Northern members of Congress, however, rejected the line, in spite of all our

attempts to get it adopted. Many of the Democratic members did so because they were in favor of the principle of non-intervention, as recommended by their candidate, General Cass; while the Whigs resisted it because they were free-soilers, and in favor of the Wilmot proviso. In the end they carried the day, and broke down the policy of division; and non-intervention was established. Shall this policy now be carried out for the future; or is it to be set aside, as the former one was, when it would have been favorable to the South? This is the first occasion since 1850 for a trial of the matter. As to the territory of Washington, organized by the last Congress, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Millson) has overlooked an important fact. Washington was a part of the Oregon territory; and the people there had, in their Territorial Legislature, passed a law prohibiting slavery. This was done before Congress applied the Wilmot proviso to it. Had we, therefore, during the last Congress, repealed their laws already established, this would have been a direct violation of the principle on which the present measure rests, viz: the right of the people to regulate their own domestic matters.

It appears, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the Kansas and Nebraska bills afford the first proper occasion for carrying out the new principles adopted in 1850.

I come now, Mr. Chairman, to what I consider the great obstacle to the passage of the bill. The main opposition to it does not arise from any of the sources as yet alluded to, but it comes from another quarter and a force which has been fighting the question under false colors and in disguise; and I now propose to unmask the character of that opposition. It seems to be well understood that every member of the old Whig party upon this floor from the North is an opponent of the bill. I understand that those gentlemen are making earnest appeals to Southern Whigs not to press this question on them, lest they should thereby break up the old Whig party. They are also deprecating agitation and insisting on quiet, &c. Those appeals are not made to me, Mr. Chairman, because for the last four or five years I have, for reasons which I will presently state, regarded myself as disconnected with that organization which these gentlemen control. In fact, I am rather out of all regular party organizations, and am regarded, I believe, as an independent. But, sir, to enable those members from the South who have less experience than myself to understand the subject properly, and to know how much weight they ought to attach to such declarations and appeals, I wish to recur to some things in the past, in no offensive spirit, but to make clear to every one the real principles upon which these gentlemen have been and are still acting.

In 1846, the Wilmot proviso was brought forward; every Whig from the free States voted for it. It produced great excitement in the country, and came very near breaking up the party. They said, however, to Southern Whigs, "Do not be alarmed about this proviso; we only mean to use it to put a stop to the Mexican war, and prevent the conquest of Mexico; and also, to split in two the Democratic party in New York, and cripple them in Pennsylvania, in Wilmot's district."

I remember how they used to put their arms around their Southern friends in the kindest manner, and exclaimed, "My God, do you suppose that we mean to push this thing, and drive you all off from us? Do not fear; we shall not press it to a practical extreme." After the war terminated, the first attempt to settle the question was by the Clayton compromise. That was not entirely satisfactory to the South. But whether we should take it or not, depended upon the chance there was of getting a better bill instead of it. The Northern Whigs, however, in a body, assailed it in the fiercest manner. They said it was a cheat in itself; that it gave the South nothing practically, and was a mere scheme of the Democratic party to unite their forces and elect General Cass. It was said that if it passed he would be elected, General Taylor would be stricken down, and utterly repudiated by the North, under the fierce excitement which would be raised, and that, possibly, even the freesoilers would carry everything. I do not know that these declarations had any weight with those Southern gentlemen who went against the bill. I doubt, in fact, if they did; but those who were here at that time know well the earnest appeals that were made to Southern men, and the promises held out of a better settlement at a future time.

The bill was defeated, and the election went, as everybody expected it would. By the division of the Democrats in the State of New York, Cass lost its vote, and in the Wilmot district in Pennsylvania, and other places, there was defection enough to lose him that State; and General Taylor carried both those States, the loss of either of which would have been fatal to him. The Northern Whigs had therefore triumphed upon their extreme anti-slavery policy. We had a right to expect, therefore, that they would at length be liberal towards us, and come to a fair adjustment of the pending issues. We met in December, after the presidential election, and, as a measure of conciliation and harmony, one of those gentlemen, Mr. Gott, of New York, introduced a bill, in most offensive language, to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia. All of those gentlemen voted for it, with the exception of Mr. Lincoln, of Illinois, only, I believe. They passed it by a heavy majority, with the aid of some freesoil Democrats. The Southern members of both Houses of Congress thereupon held a meeting in the Senate chamber. The Northern Whigs, seeing the condition of things likely to be produced, and feeling some alarm, in that same soothing and conciliating manner for which they were distinguished, said that the vote on Gott's resolution was a hasty and inconsiderate act, and that they would reconsider the resolution and reject it. They also said that the meetings which we were holding had been gotten up by General Foote, Mr. Calhoun, and other Democrats, with a covert design of breaking down General Taylor's administration before it came into power, by exciting divisions between Northern and Southern Whigs, and that we ought to have more confidence in them, than such a movement implied, and that all difficulties could be arranged amicably. These declarations had no weight with me, as I had determined not to give my co-operation further, except on just principles.

It was seen, however, that there was no occasion for action at that time on the part of the Southern members, and the excitement passed by.

But, sir, the matter did not stop there. At that session many members of the Democratic party in the Senate being still anxious to settle the question, Mr. Walker, a Senator from Wisconsin, with great liberality and manliness, brought forward a proposition as an amendment to the civil and diplomatic bill which would have settled the whole question fairly and on liberal terms. That proposition was adopted in the Senate, and came into this House, and was here supported by every Southern member of both parties, and also by many liberal Northern Democrats. It was ascertained that it was likely to pass, and thereupon the Northern Whigs, who ought rather to have desired to get the matter settled so as to avoid embarrassment to General Taylor's incoming administration, made the strongest opposition to it. They entered into a combination with the Free Soilers and Abolitionists to defeat it; and when it was seen that we would probably carry it, they as they then said and afterwards boasted, had agreed that rather than a majority should be allowed to pass it, they would call the yeas and nays until the end of the session, and thus defeat all the appropriation bills. In this way some who were in favor of it were frightened, and induced to give way, so that the measure was lost.

Then, sir, during the year following they kept this question before the people at the North, and the result was that the Cass Democrats were beaten almost everywhere in that section of the country; and when we met at the commencement of the session of 1849-'50, it was ascertained that they had nearly ninety Whig members from the North, every man of whom was pledged to vote for the Wilmot proviso and for the abolition of slavery wherever Congress had jurisdiction, and particularly in the District of Columbia. I recollect very well that in our caucus upon a resolution offered by Mr. Toombs, Mr. Brooks, of New York, said that he and his colleague, Mr. Briggs, had determined not to vote for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia during the first session of that Congress. That was all we could get by way of concession from them. They would not vote for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia the first session, but they would make no such promise for the second session, and then stood ready to vote for the proviso. Several prominent gentlemen from Massachusetts, Ohio, and other States, declared that the doctrine upon which they had been elected was that of hostility to slavery, and that they should vote for abolishing it wherever Congress had jurisdiction over the subject, and also to exclude it from all territory of the United States. To this doctrine there was no dissent from that section of the Union, though it was earnestly sought by Southern Whigs in the hope that they might find some ground for united action as a party.

Such was the condition of things at the beginning of that Congress. The country was in a state of extreme peril. The whole Northern Whig party, in great force, and a number of Democrats, also upon the Free Soil platform, were ready to act, and many of the Cass men—for by that name the non-intervention men were designated—were disposed to get out of the way, and let the bills pass, and then see what

General Taylor would do with them. There was a large majority of the Congress thus pledged to push through these measures.

I do not propose to take up the time of the committee with a rehearsal of the events of that memorable session of 1849-'50. The majority were pledged to a line of policy that they dared not then carry out; and I do not hesitate to say boldly, that if that policy had been carried out in practice, your government would not exist to-day, and ought not to have lived an hour.

They perceived what the effect was likely to be, and the remarkable condition of things was exhibited of men pledged to a certain course of conduct which they saw would be destructive, and who were begging others to keep the question out of the way, and save them from the effect of their own principles. General Taylor's administration and Cabinet, it is well known, could not get along upon the principles that had brought them into power, and were obliged to fall back upon their do-nothing policy. Why, even at the close of that session, after there had been a change of the administration—after Mr. Fillmore, who was favorable to a more liberal policy, came into power—after the admission of California as a free State, with the whole Pacific for a thousand miles embraced in it—after the passage of that series of measures which Mr. Webster himself said, as to the territory gave the North everything, and to the South nothing but the Fugitive Slave law—out of more than eighty members we found only three Northern Whigs to vote for that act, and of those three, only my friend from Ohio (Mr. Taylor) has been returned by his party. Even after the bill was passed, there was an attempt to get up the cry of repeal under the lead of Senator Seward, and great agitation made all through the North, and a large majority of these men who had refused to vote for the law concurred in the clamor; there was a fierce struggle—a struggle to catch the anti-slavery feeling there and acquire party strength. I may add, even after that, it is well known that in the selection of candidates for the Presidency they endeavored to throw out of the way, and set the seal of popular condemnation on Mr. Webster and Mr. Fillmore, because of their connection with these measures. These things have been well discussed, and are generally well understood by the country.

Why, sir, we forced them with extreme difficulty in the convention to come up and adopt a platform to carry out these measures. About half of the Northern men voted against it, and a great many of the party organs denounced and repudiated the platform, and thereby, as was proven in the end, materially contributed to the overwhelming defeat of the candidate.

I have made this review, and stated these things, Mr. Chairman, to show that these Whig gentlemen from the North, as a party, have stood all the time on extreme anti-slavery ground; that they have all the while made efforts to acquire party strength by appealing to the anti-slavery feeling of the North, and to Abolition sympathies. Now, what would you expect of them on this question? And what do you suppose they are going to do? Exactly what they have been doing for the last seven or eight years. These gentlemen are not opposing

this measure because it interferes with the Missouri compromise. Why, there is not one of them, probably, who ever alluded to that compromise, except in terms of denunciation, until the beginning of the present session. I might show you that the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. Meacham) who led off, some time since, against the Nebraska bill, in September, 1850, voted against the recognition of the Missouri line when moved by myself. I might have shown, and if I had obtained the floor when the gentleman took his seat I would have shown, that the State of Vermont has, through her representatives, repudiated every single congressional compromise ever made; not only nullifying the Fugitive Slave law of 1850, as well as the act of 1793, but all previous compromises.

In 1833, when South Carolina had taken steps to nullify the revenue laws, Mr. Clay's compromise bill was passed, bringing down the duties to twenty per centum. Afterwards, to strengthen the measure when the land distribution was passed, on motion of Senator Berrien, of Georgia, it was provided that this distribution should stop if the duties should be raised above twenty per centum; and yet this measure of compromise, thus fortified, was against the vote of the whole South, both Whig and Democrat, repealed, and the land distribution also stopped by the vote of the members from Vermont and other Northern States. Why, sir, immediately after the passage of this very act of 1820, prohibiting slavery north of $36^{\circ} 30'$, and providing for the admission of Missouri as a slave State, a resolution, in the strongest terms, was adopted by the Vermont Legislature, instructing their representatives not to let Missouri into the Union unless she abolished slavery from within her limits. If it were a compromise act, as he alleged, then his own State violated it; and so did New York, and a number of other States; and so did a large majority of the Northern members of Congress by refusing Missouri admission. No, sir; these gentlemen are now doing exactly what they have been doing for many years past, viz: affiliating with Free-Soilers and Abolitionists, and making a great effort to obtain party strength in the North by assailing the Democrats, who are more liberal to us on these questions.

Now, I do not desire to see this agitation kept up, for reasons which I will presently advert to; and I will submit the question to these gentlemen candidly, what have they gained by all this excitement, and all their denunciation of slavery? Of course they must have expected to lose the South. The wonder is that they have anybody there at all friendly to them. That it is otherwise only shows great force of party ties and attachments. In my own State, originally one of the most decided Whig States in the Union, they have placed themselves in the minority. Kentucky has her twenty-five thousand majority brought down, I believe, to about nothing at all. Tennessee likewise, and indeed the whole South, has been pretty much thrown against them. What did they gain in the North? Ohio used to be a Whig State; and I believe, at the last election, they were beaten sixty thousand votes. They were beaten everywhere in the North during the late presidential canvass, except in Massachusetts and Vermont; and they were weaker there than they were ten years ago, when they began the

agitation against slavery. They have been losing ground even at home, and why is it? I think I can tell you. It is because there is an equity in our claim to have a share of the benefits of this government that has made our cause strong in spite of all their efforts. We are a part of the American citizens who constitute the people of the Union. We pay taxes to support the government, and bear arms in time of war; and the attempt to exclude us from the benefits of the government is so unjust, that they have been losing ground on that account.

In spite of all the appeals to fanaticism and denunciation of us and our social system in New England, old men remember, and young ones have read, that when George Washington went to Boston, in 1775, to help drive the British out of the city, he was not repudiated because he was a slaveholder. New Yorkers know that in the fight at Saratoga, which perhaps determined the result of the revolutionary struggle, Gates and Morgan were thought none the less worthy companions of the brave men of the North because they were slaveholders. In the late war, Harrison and Scott, of Virginia, and Forsyth, of North Carolina, and many others from the South, were on the boundary line with the patriotic men of the North, defending the national territory. No man ever had a stronger hold on the masses of the North than Andrew Jackson. Neither he nor his great rival, Henry Clay, ever stood before a Northern audience, during the last ten years of their lives, without being welcomed with a shout of applause. The very many brave and gallant men who went from the free States into the Mexican war, will tell their neighbors that the Southern regiments who were with them, in that country, on the day of battle, stood by the American colors. They have, therefore, been constantly losing ground, while the national men have been gaining on them, in spite of their alliance with the fanaticism and sectional prejudices of the anti-slavery party. The issue is upon better footing to-day than it has ever been placed upon, viz: the right of every community to regulate its own local matters without the intervention of those having no direct interest in the questions.

It has been well said that there is a great resemblance between this issue and that involved in the struggle between the Colonies and Great Britain at the Declaration of Independence. There is however, one great and striking difference between the two cases. The Colonies in 1776 denied the right of Great Britain to tax them to the smallest extent; but the people of Kansas and Nebraska say to Congress, "You may impose any amount of taxation upon us, and we will cheerfully pay it; you may make your own disposition of the public lands, lay off your military roads and post roads, and establish your forts and arsenals; you may subject us to the action of every law of Congress that the citizens of any one State in this Union is subject to; but when you have done all that, when you have exhausted all your powers under the Constitution of the United States, then we ask the poor privilege of managing our local affairs according to our own wishes." And why should they not have? Why should Massachusetts or North Carolina control the people of those Territories? Sir, the question stands upon

the great republican right of every community to legislate for itself I know there are individuals who deny that right. It is impossible to conceal the fact that there is a large party—I do not know whether I ought to call it a party, or whether it is a mere fragment of a party—in this country who have denied that right, and who, in the bottom of their hearts, do not believe that the people are capable of self-government. It is the same feeling that prompted the old sedition act; it is the same feeling which has thrown the influence of certain men against all questions of popular right. Now, it is very hard for me to designate them. I do not know that I could properly call them the Anti-Slavery party, for that would not be a very accurate designation; nor the Federal party, even though it might do well to combine the two names. Perhaps I might refer to one of their leading organs with advantage.

The gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Stephens) I remember, commented upon the course of the *National Intelligencer*. Now, I think that journal is a faithful exponent of the party I allude to. Its regard for the Missouri compromise has been assumed only for the present occasion. I remember very well that during the struggle, up to 1850, that paper never came out for this Missouri line, although the South was battling for it for years; nor did it once assert our right to occupy the Territory in common with the people of the North, clear and indisputable as that right was. Its whole weight and influence were covertly but adroitly thrown against us, and on the anti-slavery side. I never attributed this course to any love of liberty on the part of the conductors of that paper. On the contrary, in every struggle between liberty and despotism, it takes the side of despotism; in every contest between the United States and any foreign country, it takes ground against the United States. It would be marvelous if our government were, in fact, always wrong on every issue with a foreign nation. I presume, therefore, that it is because ours is the freest government upon earth that this journal always is found taking sides against it, and for our enemies. As to our internal policy, it is the faithful organ of that party which has labored industriously, as you and I well know, sir, to destroy all the limitations of the Federal Constitution, and substitute an absolute central government in its stead. These people have taken their opinions mainly from the Tory press and the Tory party of England; and those opinions happen to be anti-slavery, as well as anti-republican. They seem to desire no higher honor than to have the privilege of adopting and defending everything which comes from these sources. If any gentleman will take the trouble to examine some of the British anti-slavery journals, he will see the whole programme of our Abolition countrymen laid down there. They praise and defend the British policy in all things. A few years ago, for example, Great Britain voted \$100,000,000 to liberate her negroes in Jamaica, and convert them into savages; and since that event two millions of her white people at home have perished miserably by famine. It is demonstrable that if that sum had been applied properly at home, every one of these unfortunate Irish men, women and children might have been saved. Even if she would devote the

millions which are now expended annually for the benefit of the negroes in Africa, she would save the lives of her own white people. Still her policy in all things is defended by her allies here.

Great Britain is a very sagacious Power, and not less selfish than sagacious. She knows well that in the future she has more to dread from the United States than from any other nation. She knows that our people are contesting with her now wherever the sea rolls, and wherever mind comes in contact with mind. But she is too cautious and far-sighted to assail us on a point where we are united. Hence she attacks us upon matters connected with slavery, and straightway you see the Abolition party, headed by such leaders as the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Giddings,) at once arising in her behalf, and making a terrific clamor throughout the land, and distracting the public mind and diverting it from the real issue. And you see that larger anti-slavery party, of which the *Intelligencer* is an organ, at once likewise taking sides with her upon all such questions. Even though they do not succeed in effecting anything practically in the way of the abolition of slavery, or in bringing about a collision between different sections of country, yet they do a great deal for her, our rival. They keep us in an eternal agitation about this question of slavery to the neglect of great national interests. We do not put our public defences in a proper condition; we fail to protect sufficiently the rights of our citizens abroad, whether in the fisheries of the northeast, in Central America, in Cuba, or elsewhere; and therefore, I say, it is a wise as well as selfish policy on the part of Great Britain to keep us embroiled in such difficulties and discussions, so that her anti-slavery allies here, who are very faithful to her, can assist her in carrying out her policy.

I desire, sir, that this question of the organization of the Territory of Nebraska shall be treated as a great American question, with no foreign influence brought to bear upon it. It will be found, I think, that I have done no injustice to any one in the course of remark in which I have indulged. Whoever is familiar with the political records of Congress and the country, which I have merely glanced at, will find my conclusions right. At any rate, I am confident that I shall be able to defend and maintain every single allegation made. Instead of meeting the Nebraska question on its merits, its opponents are heaping a great deal of denunciation on the friends of this bill, especially Senator Douglas and President Pierce. A great flood of calumny has been opened upon Judge Douglas especially. The manner in which it has been manifested at certain points in the North is equally malicious, contemptible, cowardly, and mean; and not less futile and harmless, than contemptible and mean. Neither the statesman of the Granite State, nor the young champion of the western Democracy, will ever be harmed by these assaults. He who is most thoroughly identified with this great popular American principle will be borne with it onward and upward in its career of triumph. In the discussion of this question I have been particularly struck by one fact, and that is, the unwillingness of the opponents of the measure to meet the issue fairly. And hence they are falling back on the opinions of our ancestors of 1775 and 1776 upon the question of slavery. They seem

anxious to get rid of the light of the nineteenth century, and fall back upon the opinions of a former age, and of the men who lived when the government began its existence.

Now, sir, it is universally admitted that the Constitution of the United States itself has nothing in it to support these anti-slavery views; on the contrary, every single provision in that instrument is pro-slavery—that is, for the protection, and defense, and increase of slavery. For example, one of them is that provision by which the slave trade was extended for twenty years, by which the Constitution expressly forbade Congress to put a stop to the trade for that period, and under which provision most of the negroes were brought into this country. That feature, it is well known, was adopted by the entire New England vote, in convention, with the aid of South Carolina and Georgia, against the other Southern and Middle States.

But, Mr. Chairman, I admit that there are many opinions against slavery expressed by individuals, such as Jefferson and others, as private persons, and which have been referred to in the discussion of this question. No man has more respect than I have for the opinions of the great men of that day on all subjects in which they were fully enlightened as to the facts. I hold their authority on such questions as entitled to the greatest weight. But no man will pretend that the world has not made a prodigious advance in knowledge since their time. No sensible or enlightened man would go back to Benjamin Franklin, philosopher as he was, for information on scientific subjects, or adopt his views as to mechanics, electrical, or steam machinery, in preference to many men of our day. But among all the great advances that have been made in human science—whether you take geology, chemistry, or any other branch of knowledge—the greatest advance, perhaps, of all has been made in the science of government, and of the difference of the races of men and their adaptation to different social institutions. In the last century, sir, many of the leading men of the country looked, no doubt, upon the negro as in every respect like a white man, except that, by some strange freak of nature, the former had a black skin. That idea no longer prevails. The whole doctrine of negro equality with white men has been exploded in our day, not merely in the South, but throughout the United States.

The people of Indiana and of Illinois have recently—and that, too, by an immense majority—decided against that equality; and have forbidden any negro to enter into those States. In the State of Connecticut, too, when the proposition to enable negroes to vote was submitted to the people of that State a few years ago, the question was decided by a vote of nearly four to one against the negro; and they were refused the privilege of voting merely because they *were negroes*. New York has recently done the same thing. In fact, there is not a single free State, where the issue has been directly made upon the question of negro equality, that the mass of the people have not decided against it; nor can it be made without the same result.

I happened, Mr. Chairman, to be in Connecticut when this vote was taken. I found that most of the newspapers seemed to be on the side of the negroes, and many of the literary men of the State, and they

anticipated a triumph; but when the votes of the people came to be counted, the result was altogether the other way. Why, Mr. Chairman, if all the literary men on the earth were to argue that the rays of the sun were the cause of darkness and cold, they never could convince the people who walk in this glorious sunshine that their theory was correct. They might persuade those who live down in the bowels of the earth—those who work in the coal mines of Great Britain all their lives. So, too, these Abolitionists many convince the people of England of the equality of the negro to the white man, because they do not see the negro, and, in fact, know nothing about him; but our Americans, who have seen the specimens, cannot be thus humbugged.

I say, sir, that the idea of negro equality no longer exists in the United States as a fact. I care nothing about theories, nor how this difference is accounted for. Some of our Abolition brethren, being soft-headed, and easily deluded on all subjects, for example, say that the negro is different from the white man because of the effect of climate, manner of life, and want of opportunity to become civilized, &c. All history and fact is at war with these ideas. The negro has been placed by Providence in that country and climate most favorable to his health and well-being; and his opportunities for acquiring the advantages of early civilization were vastly greater than those of the Northern barbarians, from whom we have ourselves descended. They were, more than four thousand years ago, in contact with the Egyptians, the most enlightened nation of antiquity. Afterwards the Carthaginians, a highly intelligent Phœnician colony of white men, the first people of their day, overran all Northern Africa, and brought some of the negro races into subjection. Then came the great Roman Empire, which civilized everything else it touched, but made no impression upon the negroes. The Saracens, too, the first people of the middle ages, who gave light to the Western European nations, and who extended their conquests south of the Great Desert, left the negroes where they found them—savages.

A second class of inquirers as to the cause of the difference between negroes and white men take a Biblical view of the question, and suppose that, inasmuch as the descendants of one man were, by a judgment of the Almighty, sentenced to be slaves forever, it is but reasonable and natural that there should be distinguishing outward marks in their organization.

The third class, embracing almost all the great men of science, hold that the negro race is specifically different from the white race. I care not what view gentlemen take, but the fact may be assumed as settled in the American mind, that there is a material difference between the negro and the white man. As Canning said, facts are stubborn things. There is a *higher law*, but it is the law of nature. When God Almighty implants His characteristics upon natural objects, man cannot change them. If a political system is in accordance with those natural laws, it will be successful. The American Constitution has been well framed in accordance with those principles. But, on the other hand, in Mexico and Jamaica, and in other places, where they

have undertaken to upset the law of Providence, and to establish the doctrine of negro equality, nothing but mischief has been produced.

Since the time of our revolutionary fathers, these great discussions, supported by innumerable facts, have shaken the human mind to its center, and brought it to a conclusion of which they did not dream. Hence their opinions are worth very little in this debate. Let no man, Mr. Chairman, suppose such topics as I am now discussing are abstractions, having no real weight. These considerations, more or less, are constantly acting on the minds of men, and, in fact, are daily referred to by the opponents of the measure under examination. In another point of view, too, there has been a great change of opinion during the present age. I speak with reference to the profitableness of slave labor, and the prosperity of slaveholding countries.

The free States have fifty-four majority upon this floor. Under the old apportionment they had fifty-one, a gain of three members over the South in ten years. Sir, during that time there have been about two millions of foreigners added to the population of this country by immigration, and nearly every one of these persons have settled in the free States. If, therefore, their increase by natural means had been proportionate to that of the South, they ought to have made a gain of some twenty members instead of three, especially when the admission of California is considered.

I refer to this matter to show that our population has increased more rapidly than even that of the free States, great and prosperous as they are. That population, also, is a productive one. We make abundant provision for ourselves as respects agricultural products generally, and are able to send a large amount of grain, &c., out of our territory, both to the North and to foreigners. In addition to all this, our production of cotton in some years amounts to nearly \$150,000,000 worth; the sugar and molasses to nearly \$20,000,000; and the tobacco, rice, &c., to a large amount. We thus furnish two-thirds of the exports to foreign countries, giving thereby employment to the immense shipping interest of the Union, and enabling our tonnage already to equal that of Great Britain. Do not these facts prove that our system of industry is one that is eminently productive?

Gentlemen may tell me that one cannot get as much work out of a slave as a free man would perform. I grant it. But they forget that among a free population a large proportion are non-producers all their lives, and that even the working classes are unemployed a great part of their time; and the young persons of both sexes are usually unemployed, and, in fact, an expense, until they attain maturity. On the contrary, the negroes are almost all kept constantly at work in some way, and the consequence is, that these three millions of slaves actually produce more, probably, than the same number of free persons in any other section of the country. I do not mention these things to claim superiority for the South over the North, but merely to establish the equality of my section. You will find, too, that we have just as many churches as the free States have, and fewer paupers and criminals than any country upon earth perhaps can show. These things are stated to prove that our system is a prosperous one, and that there is no

reason why this government should be arrayed against it. I point to the fact, also, that the negroes are, whether considered physically, intellectually, socially, or morally, superior to any other portion of their race upon the globe, whether in a state of freedom or slavery.

These are views of which little or nothing was known fifty years ago; but they are taking deep hold upon the public mind now, and statesmen and wise men will look at things as they are, and ponder well before they act in opposition to the evidences of their senses and their reason. The ways of Providence are wiser than the imaginations of men, and let us therefore follow where the facts seem to point. No man knows as yet what we shall be led to; but the opinion of the country is very different now from what it was fifty years ago; and what it will be a century hence, can any man assume to say? No, sir; but the wise man will be disposed to let these things alone; he will rather permit these matters work their own way in due time. Under the influence of excited feelings, and in pursuit of a single idea, men are sometimes carried to great extremes. For example many of the Northern people insist that slavery must not be extended, but that it must be confined to its present limits. It will thus happen, say they, that after a time for want of room, the slave population will no longer increase; and perhaps the low price of labor, and the want of means of subsistence, will induce the owners to liberate their slaves. They say that the condition of the present slave States will be like that of portions of Europe, where the population cannot increase, and where a bare subsistence can be afforded to the people in ordinary years, so that in a scarce year large numbers are swept away by famine. In this way, they argue the increase of slaves could be prevented. A not less effectual mode, however, would be to put to death the infant negroes from time to time. This, too, would be more humane, probably, than the other process, as the amount of general misery produced by a condition of things similar to that in Ireland during the years of famine, would doubtless greatly exceed that caused by the mode suggested. Intelligent men at the North of course know that the Southern States would not consent to submit to such a line of policy, and that the attempt to enforce it will merely overthrow the government. In fact, the amount of property now held in slaves, and the interests connected with it are strong enough to protect themselves. In France and other European countries, the strongest political systems that men could invent have been overthrown, from time to time, but the rights of property have withstood all the shocks of revolutions. So the interests which the South has will be strong enough to protect themselves—always, I hope, in the Union, but certainly out of it, should it ever become necessary. These considerations need not, however, enter largely into the present discussion. We stand on our constitutional rights, and the justice, both political and moral, of the proposition that every community ought to be allowed to regulate its own domestic matters. Adopt this cardinal line of policy, and the country will no more be disturbed with agitations about slavery.

Mr. Chairman, there was considerable excitement produced in the House yesterday by a resolution which the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr.

Campbell) offered in reference to the annexation of Canada. This movement will enable us to illustrate the practical effect of the pending measure. If the old system of bringing the powers of the government into collision with the rights of the South, by restricting slavery, is to prevail, as Canada would strengthen the Northern movement against us, we should be opposed to its annexation. But suppose we adopt the opposite line of policy, and settle down upon the doctrine that every community shall regulate its own local and domestic affairs. Why, sir, the proposition for the annexation of Canada would be looked upon simply as a national question, as one in which the North and South were equally interested, and the advantages and disadvantages of the measures would be fairly considered by both sections. I am not by any means prepared to say that the time will not come when Canada, as well as many other provinces, will be annexed to the United States. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Millson) that there is danger of too rapid expansion of our territory. I believe in the law of progress, but there may be such a thing as too high a rate of speed for safety. I admit all this, but must tell him that it is idle to attempt to prevent a forward movement. He might just as well strive to dam up the waters of that Niagara to which he alluded as prevent the expansion of our Republic. We must act wisely, however, and place ourselves in a condition to be benefited and not injured by these coming acquisitions of territory.

What ought we to do? Allow every portion of the country to regulate its own affairs, whether States or Territories, and turn our attention to those great national questions upon which the interests of the country demand our action. But, in justice to myself, I perhaps ought to say that while I would not hurry expansion of territory, yet neither am I prepared to say that the infant does not now live who may see all the country between Cape Horn and the Polar ocean of the north united in one empire. I do not say that it will be so, nor am I prepared to say to what extent this confederation of republics may be carried. We are in the midst of the grandest experiment humanity has ever seen; and if we do our part wisely, I have no doubt but that, under the favor of Providence, a fortunate result will be attained.

I have witnessed, Mr. Chairman, several of those anti-slavery excitements, and I have observed that when they are first gotten up their power seems to be the greatest. The Abolitionists are well organized; they throw out their publications all over the country at once, without being over-scrupulous as to the truth and justice of their statements; and hence they hurry away the minds of the community for a season. Truth cannot travel as fast as falsehood, but in the end always overtakes her. Hence, after a full discussion and a fair understanding of the subject, the excitement is shorn of its strength, and dies out before the intelligence of the people. For example, when the question of the annexation of Texas first came up, the cry was raised that the whole North was dead against it, and that any who advocated it would be instantly crushed. Even after the matter had been adopted by the Democratic party in its convention in Baltimore on Mr. Polk's nomination, and even as late as September, the convention in New

York which nominated Silas Wright for Governor, passed a resolution against the annexation of Texas, though agreeing to support Mr. Polk nevertheless; and, in fact, when Congress met, even after the election, there was great opposition among Democratic members, but ultimately the body of these gentlemen, with the aid of some few Southern Whigs came up and passed it. I have yet to learn that a single one of them was beaten on that ground. I remember, also, when the Wilmot proviso was first brought forward, there were only six or seven gentlemen from the North who voted against it. We were told to take our last look of those gentlemen; that they went home to their political graves. Such was the language used then; but one of the preachers who pronounced their funeral sermon on more than one occasion was left at home himself; while the opponents of the Wilmot proviso came up here thicker than ever. In a little while that proviso found none so poor as to do it reverence.

When the Fugitive Slave law passed I was told by gentlemen who were favorable to it that it was producing an intensity of feeling in the North of which we could have no idea. They said that the whole North was against it; and in the South many were alarmed at the agitation, and some of the States passed resolutions in the strongest terms for the enforcement of the law. I do not know that anybody has been defeated because of that bill in the North where a fight was firmly made on the issue. How will it be on this occasion? Some gentlemen will go forward and tell their constituents that a great wrong has been done to the North. What is it? Why, that Congress has actually had the unparalleled—I will not say impudence, but want of justice—to allow the people of Kansas and Nebraska to legislate for themselves in local matters. Now, Mr. Chairman, do you think that it will produce any excitement when the question is understood? Not a bit of it. When the idea is first thrown out that we are repealing the Missouri compromise to let slavery into that Territory, there will be the greatest excitement; but as the question comes to be canvassed and examined from time to time, the result will be that the issue will take a hold on the popular mind which none can resist.

I have never in my life been afraid, when I felt that I was right, to make an issue and debate a question before the people. I recollect very well that some years ago I was the only man from the South who voted for the reception of abolition petitions, and against the twenty-first rule. There was a very intense excitement in my part of the country against their reception; but when I came to discuss and examine the question, I was fully sustained by the people.

And here let me say that I do not deprecate debate on the subject of slavery. On the contrary, my own opinion is that a calm, temperate discussion of all these questions in Congress is positively beneficial. When I came here, ten years ago, it was the fashion for Southern men to say that "you cannot venture to discuss slavery. It must not be talked about in Congress." The consequence was the Abolitionists were rampant when they saw that we seemed to be afraid of them, and they pressed upon us, getting stronger and stronger all the time as we appeared to retreat and quail before them. The most cowardly cur, if

you run from him, will follow and bite you. I took at once a different view, and was disposed to meet the question; taking the ground calmly then that we had better confront our enemies face to face. The great discussion which has since occurred, I am quite confident, has strengthened our position all through the North. Liberal men in that section now find less difficulty in sustaining themselves. The Northern and the Southern people agree better and better as they come to understand each other's views.

There is a great amount of common sense and good feeling among our people everywhere; and the discussion, sir, of all these questions has been productive of nothing but benefit. Remember that we cannot prevent the Abolitionists debating these things. They will go all through the North, and spread their pamphlets far and near. They will have their preachers and lecturers. I have had a great many sermons sent to me lately. They have two striking qualities—rhetoric and ignorance; and the very fact that so many of these Northern preachers—I mean Abolition preachers—have neglected their holy calling to embark in politics, is probably the reason why infidelity is making such a great headway among the Abolitionists. I am very sorry to see it. [Laughter.] I think that it would be better for them to discuss religion. Unless they cease we shall be compelled to send missionaries among them. [Laughter.] I read many of their papers, and, in common with the rest of the community, am shocked with witnessing their infidelity and blasphemy. They will eternally keep up this discussion about slavery. Then why not let it be calmly and temperately debated, since it is necessarily before us in connection with this bill, and will be brought up occasionally by kindred topics?

As my time has expired, I omit some points that I had intended to discuss, and I shall now take my seat, thanking the committee for the attention with which they have heard me.

NOTE.

The passage of the Kansas and Nebraska act, produced great excitement, especially in the North. Inflammatory meetings were held, and bodies of men were armed and sent into the territory, even while the measure was under consideration, in order that they might control it, and prevent its ever becoming a slave State. When emigrants from Missouri and other Southern States went in, collisions occurred, which added to the high political excitement. Even in the South, there was division; many of the Whigs, though in 1850, they had all been in favor of the principle, that no law of Congress should be allowed to interfere with the right of the inhabitants of every territory to establish or reject slavery now changed their ground. From the influence of party feelings, they sympathised so much with their associates in the North, that such men as Messrs. Badger and Kerr were censured by their former admirers. The state of feeling thus produced in the country both North and South, may be understood perhaps from the reading of the letter given below :

ASHEVILLE, Sep. 21, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: On my return, after an absence of some days, I found your letter of the 2d instant, inviting me to be present at a dinner to be given "irrespective of party" to the Hon. John Kerr, as a compliment to

him for his course, especially with reference to the Nebraska bill of the last session of Congress. Entertaining the highest respect personally for your distinguished representative, and heartily approving his course on the occasion referred to, if my engagements permitted it would give me the greatest pleasure to accept the invitation. The importance of the Kansas and Nebraska act cannot be overrated. It removed from the statute book an odious and unjust discrimination which had existed there for nearly half a century. That restriction, a mark of inferiority, was degrading to the South, and as such, ought never to have been originally submitted to by her. In consequence, however, of the want either of wisdom, or manliness and courage on the part of the men of 1820, there rested the highest obligation upon every right thinking and right feeling son of the South, to avail himself of the first fair opportunity to place his section back again where it originally stood, on an equal footing with the North. This result has now been accomplished, and we stand as equals in the Union with our brethren of the North. All who have taken a part in this transaction, may well feel proud of the accomplishment. I declare to you, gentlemen, that after a Congressional service of nearly ten years, I would rather that every vote of mine on all other question should be obliterated from the Journals, than be deprived of my participation in that one act.

As a citizen of this great Republic, I would rather that my name should go down to posterity associated with those of the true and brave men who carried this measure, than to have had part in all the legislation that has been transacted in my time. Whether the territory of Kansas will ever constitute a slaveholding State, as it inevitably would if left to voluntary settlement and the usual course of things, or whether the extraordinary combination between northern capitalists and abolition associations shall prevent this, will not, in my judgment, materially diminish the importance of the measure. The Federal Government has done us justice, however much reason we may have to complain of the acts of a portion of the northern people. We now stand in a position of equality, and we owe it to those who are to come after us, and to the cause of truth, justice and of political liberty in all time to come, never to surrender that favorable position. No consideration, either pecuniary or political, no love of temporary ease and quiet, can atone for such a sacrifice, because no people have ever been permanently prosperous, who have admitted their inferiority to others, or consented to be degraded to a state of political vassalage. A sense of sectional or national ignominy *unnans* and in time destroys any people. To this, like other law of Providence, no exception can be found in history. We must, therefore, I repeat, maintain our present position at any cost. Any one of our citizens who is capable of doubting on such a point, ought to be regarded as unfit to occupy any public station.

This great measure was not passed without extreme difficulty. In fact I know of no parliamentary act that has been carried in the face of such formidable, obstinate, and unscrupulous opposition.

Those Southern representatives who contributed by their efforts to its success, are worthy of great praise, but no applause which language can express, is adequate to do justice to the representatives from the North who stood by us in the struggle. These gentlemen, against all calcula-

tions of personal or political advantage, in defiance of the opposition of sectional prejudices, of abolition clamor, and all the denunciations of fanaticism, with unwavering firmness, and a courage never surpassed for its magnanimity, came into the struggle and carried the measure triumphantly. They well knew the peril they incurred, but their manly love of right and justice caused them to disregard all selfish considerations. Those who saw that they would be put down for the time, felt confident, nevertheless, that in the end truth would triumph over all opposition, and full justice be done to their motives.

We ought, therefore, to lose no proper occasion for bestowing merited commendation on these men. Those individuals in the South who assail their motives, ought to be covered with contempt and execration as deep as that which would bury him who should sneer at the motives of Lafayette or Kosciuszko, and charge that they marched under the banners of Washington merely from a selfish hope of reward.

Undoubtedly the original yielding, renders it more difficult now to defend our just rights, but I do not despair at all of our being able, by proper efforts, to maintain our position in the Union, provided our resolution to do so is sufficiently decided and general.

Permit me in conclusion, gentlemen, to express my grateful sense of the complimentary manner in which you have been pleased to refer to my own course in this connexion.

With sentiments of the highest regard, your obedient servant,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

There can be no question but that the passage of this act with the attending circumstances, added to the strength of the anti-slavery party of the North. Still the effect thus really produced by the measure, was not so great as it appeared. Though there was apparent quiet then, it was because the North as a section, had nothing really to complain of, on account of the measures of 1850. But any practical issue, which might have the appearance of strengthening the South, would at once have created excitement. So strong and settled had become the opposition to permitting the South to acquire any additional territory, that might tend to strengthen it, for purposes of defence, that any such measure would have arrayed the majority of the Northern people against it.

In addition to this, however, the repeal of the restriction of 36 degrees 30 minutes, had the appearance of extending slavery into territory previously made free, and also violating an old compromise. This added strength to the former purpose, to resist the extension of slavery and caused the Free-soilers and Abolitionists to obtain such power as to enable them to beat so many of the Democratic candidates, as to give them the control of the succeeding House of Representatives.

They were greatly aided, however, by a new and singular movement in American politics, that took place about this time. It was the creation of the "American" or "Know-Nothing" party. This organization suddenly acquired great strength, especially in the North. Not only did the Whigs generally enter it, but the Democrats who were hostile to the Kansas and Nebraska act, also joined it in large numbers. Though they would not generally have been willing to join an organization called *Whig*, to which they had been opposed, yet they were not adverse to uniting in making a new party. After the overthrow and destruction of the new organization, having already been separated from the Democracy, they were more easily induced

to assist in forming soon afterwards another new party which adopted the name of Republican.

Not only did this result flow from the Know-Nothing organization, but it seems to have been the original parent of the "Wide Awakes" of the Lincoln campaign, "Loyal Leagues" of a later period, and of those other organizations popularly designated as "Kuklux." There can be no doubt but that such secret political organizations have exerted a demoralizing and mischievous effect on the country.

[So extraordinary has been the advance in the amount paid as compensation to officers, and such has been the general increase in the public expenditures of the country, that the following remarks may be of some interest, as tending to show the beginnings of the movement:]

REMARKS

ON THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURES, MADE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 17, 1854.

MR. CLINGMAN said: Mr. Speaker: I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his demand for the previous question for one moment. I promise to renew it.

MR. JONES. I withdraw the demand for the previous question.

MR. CLINGMAN. I desire to say only a word or two to the House in regard to this bill. It may be unpleasant to gentlemen who have made up their mind to vote for it to hear any remarks; but I do not think that the bill in all its features is thoroughly understood. I promise not to be tedious, as I desire only to make a few suggestions. The proposition now under consideration is a very important one, as it increases, by several hundred thousand dollars, the annual expenses of the Government; and I think that we may be likely to hurry it through without due examination, and without giving members an opportunity for that discussion and consideration which all bills making appropriations of money ought to receive. It is a bill which appropriates a large sum of money; but the principal effect is more objectionable than the waste of money even. We have lately got into great difficulty in regard to the subject of the appointment of clerks. It is well known that there is an immense rush here for offices. Every man here is pressed from time to time with applications from their constituents to get them situations in the different offices of the Government.

I believe that the action of Congress during the last session has contributed very much to produce this evil of which I speak. Everybody admits that the fact of there being so much office-seeking under the Government is a very serious vice. There is a very great desire to get into public offices, and there is a constantly increasing number of men who are seeking for them. The result is, that whenever we have a State or a presidential election, there is an immense excitement in the country;

and Congress ought not to legislate in any way that will tend to increase this mischief.

At the last session of Congress there was a proposition brought in to increase the salaries of the clerks. The eight-hundred-dollar clerks were raised up to a salary of one thousand dollars, and all classes of these employees were moved forward to a higher rate of compensation.

During the discussion upon that occasion I remember very well that an eloquent friend of mine [Mr. Gentry, of Tennessee,] made a handsome plea in favor of the increase. He told us of a young man in the practice of the law in his own State who came here and obtained a thousand-dollar clerkship. He brought his wife and family here, and he found that he could not conveniently sustain himself upon his salary. He presented the case very feelingly and ably, and the consequence was that the House went forward, and passed a bill for the increased compensation. The present bill raises the salaries of the lower class of clerks to twelve hundred dollars per year; the second class to fourteen hundred, and so on. It also gives back-pay, additional, to the clerks that have already been in office. It thus appears that there is a greater demand for an increased salary than before. Let us see how that is brought about. Here, for instance, is a young man practicing law in Tennessee. He is informed that men obtain at Washington what he regards as a high salary. He makes an application through his friends, obtains an appointment to an office in one of the Departments, and comes on here and enters upon the performance of its duties. He finds that his expenses are considerable; holds office for a few years, and then probably leaves it, or is turned out under an incoming Administration. In nineteen out of twenty such cases the individual goes home insolvent, or nearly so—a great many of them, perhaps, having contracted bad habits from their associations in Washington.

Now, if the public service required this, I would vote the money, and let the men be sacrificed, just as men are sacrificed in battle, or die by disease contracted upon the frontiers. But if the public service does not demand it, there is no just principle which requires that we should give it. The rule which an individual adopts for his government in like cases, is to give that sum which will secure a competent man to perform the duties which he desires. I know of no other principle which the Government should adopt for the guidance of its action.

If you want a mere copying clerk, any man who can keep a country school in your district or mine, or who would be employed as a merchant's clerk to keep books, is competent for that purpose. Such individuals are glad to get three or four hundred dollars a year in the country; and we have such individuals constantly coming to us to obtain employment in directing speeches and documents, or to seek places as messengers in the Departments, at that rate of pay. I remember a case which will, perhaps, illustrate the principle. I will state it. At the beginning of this session a lady came to me with a letter of introduction, who stated to me that she had a husband who was a messenger in one of the Departments, and got thirty dollars per month; that his health was very bad, and that he was barely able to discharge his duties. He was not able to attend to any other sort of business when not performing office duty, and he had half a dozen children. She was very anxious

to get one of her sons in here as a page in the House. I called upon the Doorkeeper of the House, who is a very polite and obliging man, and asked him to give this boy a place. He informed me that he could not, because several members of Congress had brought on young boys from the distant States for the purpose of getting these situations for them. The conclusion I came to was, that the pages are paid so well as to make it worth while to bring on these boys from the distant parts of the Union, to get these appointments. Our pages receive two dollars a day, regular compensation. During the last session of Congress, by a two-thirds vote, but against mine, the House agreed to give the pages a sum in addition as an extra allowance, amounting to considerable more than their salary for the session, making their pay as much as four or five dollars a day; and the result is, as I stated, that boys are brought on from the remote States, and secure places, while those in the city who need the pay as much are excluded. This is an abuse which I have constantly opposed, but unsuccessfully heretofore. In fact, at each session I am in a minority of less than one-third, generous members giving away the public money to their favorites here.

I want to call the attention of the House to another fact. There are persons in this city who are glad to be employed as copying clerks, at a dollar a day. But when you raise the salary of copying clerks to \$1,000 a year, you throw these persons out of employment. And how? Why, as soon as the salaries are raised, and the fact becomes known abroad, young politicians from North Carolina, from Tennessee, and from the remote States, will come here and apply for the places. They are young men out of business, or, perhaps, a little above their business, and having political influence, they secure the situations; and those here in the city are displaced. This is the way the system works; while you take more and more from your Treasury, you get no better officers, but, in fact, worse ones.

Suppose you were to pay the workmen employed upon the wings of your Capitol ten dollars a day; the consequence would be that men would come on here from every quarter of the Union and apply for situations. Political influence would be brought into requisition, and the Superintendent would probably finally be obliged to distribute his workmen among the different States, as the cadets and midshipmen are now distributed. As it is now, the ordinary price is paid, and proper workmen are obtained, without any noise being made abroad in reference to it.

I know we are called upon to be liberal to these clerks, and I should be very glad to be so; I have several friends from my section of country among them. But it is not our own money that we are voting away. We only act as the trustees of the people; and I am not going to vote to raise the compensation of these clerks still higher when hundreds of my constituents work quite as hard at home, and do not receive more than fifty or seventy-five cents a day for it. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, I should say to you, I am directed by one of my constituents to get some work done for him; I am his agent merely, or trustee; I can get it done for \$100, but there is a good clever fellow who wants me to give him \$200 as a favor to do it; and I should tell you, further, my constituent is a poor man but an honest one, and a hard worker, with a large family that he is trying to educate, and he finds it very difficult to get along

and maintain them. You would at once tell me that, as an honest man, I had no right to give away \$100 of his money merely to gratify one of my favorites; that I would act fraudulently as a trustee, if I were to spend his money thus. Suppose, sir, I should go to one of my constituents who was plowing in his field, and say to him, Why do you not hire hands at seventy five cents or a dollar per day, to help you tend more land and make a bigger crop? He will tell me, "I cannot afford to give anybody seventy-five cents per day. I cannot give fifty cents per day in cash to hire a hand. I am not, perhaps, clearing that amount myself." If I should say to him, "Now, my friend, you are taxed on your plow, on your salt, your sugar, the woolen goods you wear, or the blankets you buy to protect your family from the inclemency of the season. Are you willing to pay an additional tax; you who are making from fifty to seventy-five cents per day? Are you willing to pay an additional tax to enable some others to get more than four or five dollars per day, who are not working near as hard as you do?" He will tell me instantly, "No!" Have I the right to take that man's money who pays it for public purposes, for necessary expenses, and appropriate it to an uncalled for increase of salary, merely to gratify my favorites? The moment I go beyond the line of what is just and proper; the moment I determine to give a man more than his work is worth—for the value of every man is regulated by the demand for his services—I cannot say that I do what my duty calls for. If I employ a man to do my private work, and I pay him more than he gets from anybody else, I pay him well. The fact that you can get men to come forward and seek these offices, if you were to put them down to \$500 or \$600, is evident that they are doing better here, in their opinion, than anywhere else.

The only rule for Congress to adopt is the one which I have laid down, and that is, to pay what is necessary to obtain competent men. I admit, for higher officers, your Commissioner of Pensions and others, who are required to understand the laws of the country, and ought to have judicial minds, you ought to pay more. The rule we have to adopt is to pay what will secure the necessary work. Do as any honest trustee would do with a trust fund. Where he has to spend any money for his trustors, he will spend only as much as will get the work done. If you, Mr. Speaker, and I were employed to have a house built for a man, we would not think it right to pay twice as much as we could get the work well done for merely to gratify those in our employ.

And I will beg, Mr. Speaker, that gentlemen will bear one thing in mind. There has not been a single instance, during my time in Congress, where the emoluments of an office have been reduced. I do not speak of petty post offices. We reduced the salaries there, indirectly, by reducing the rates of postage. You will find that whenever you move a man forward—I do not care what office he fills—the result is that he stands where he is advanced. This matter of salaries is an advancing tide; it never recedes.

Again: You cannot satisfy the wants of these gentlemen. Suppose you raise the clerkships up to \$8,000 per year, the amount now given cabinet officers. Well, the result will be that men who have been Governors in their own States, or Senators of the United States, understanding that they can get \$8,000 per year, will come here, and such men will

fill the clerkships. They will crowd out those individuals who would be glad to do the work at lower rates; and after they have held those offices ten years, they will petition, if they think that we will listen to their petitions. They will tell us that house rent is high; that they are bound to entertain their friends when they come here; that it cost a great deal to keep up carriages, and rent pews in fashionable churches, and that they must have an increase to \$10,000 per year.

There is not a man in the country who is making money as fast as he wants to, and there is not a man holding office who gets as much as he would like to get; and if you will ask him whether he ought to have an advance, he will answer, "Yes, I can turn this money to a good account."

Gentlemen talk to me about liberality. I can very well understand the liberality of the man who puts his hand into his own pocket and pays out his own money. I do not call it liberality to misuse the money of other people, and give it away to favorites. This money is raised by taxation. It is taken from an unwilling, reluctant community. They are willing to pay as much as we need, and nothing more. And I do not feel that I can, with any sort of propriety, insist on taxing my constituents, the majority of whom cannot make one dollar per day, to enable others to get a much larger sum, when we can secure the services for less.

I want to present these considerations to the House. I intend, at some time during this session, if I get the opportunity on one of the appropriation bills, to say something about the character of the public expenditures of the country. They vastly exceed those of any other country in the world. You may go to London, Paris, or anywhere else, and you will not find the public expenditures there like the amount paid for the same service here. I know that the rate of wages is higher in the United States, but it is no reason why we should pay ten times as much for the same service as others do, when we can get it for the half only.

This is a thankless duty which I am discharging, sir. We are surrounded by a constant pressure. It is a very popular thing to be generous, and vote the people's money out of the Treasury. If that money came into the Treasury just as the water comes into the Potomac, I should be glad to hand it about to everybody around us; but when I remember that it comes there by taxation upon the people, I do not feel at liberty to vote it away unnecessarily.

Sir, this government of the United States is rapidly becoming the most extravagant in the world; in fact, it is the most extravagant for its service, and it will soon become the most profligate and wasteful, for it is the nature of all vices growing out of expenditures to increase rapidly. Everybody knows that the decay of the Roman Republic arose from the fact, that in its latter days the public men gave away the money, lands, and other public property for votes to make themselves popular, and to be elected consuls and pro-consuls; but they were in the habit of giving it to the soldiers, and there was, therefore, some excuse for it; they said these men had defended the country. We, however, are making ourselves popular by voting money and lands to men engaged in the civil service, or who have performed no service at all. The result is that things are moving on at railroad speed. We are constantly increasing

our expenditures with less service. It is a notorious fact that we do not get better service now, in the Departments, than we got twenty or thirty years ago, when we did not spend one half as much. I beg gentlemen to look at this matter. If you will put down these expenses to the lowest rate that will pay and secure competent men, that is all they have a right to expect you to do. When you have done that, you will not have this great pressure for office; you will not have the whole country seeking office, and this perpetual struggle in politics. You will get the work well done, and remember, too, that by tempting these men to quit their usual business, and come on here to seek office, you do them a great deal more mischief than good.

I have made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, merely to indicate the grounds of my opposition to this bill. I should like to gratify these clerks, and pages, and others, by voting them money; but I do not feel that I can do it with justice to my constituents. I would much rather avoid making this opposition. I would much rather that some other gentleman should come out and present the points of objection to these measures. I think this bill ought to be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and be discussed there, as all money bills should be discussed. If its principles will stand discussion, then let it pass, and I will acquiesce in it. I do not believe they will stand discussion. I do not believe there is a congressional district in the Union where these expenditures, which we are making all from good feeling, and to gratify persons around us, would be justified by the people; because it can be shown that you do not benefit the donees at all, taking them as a class; you may benefit an individual here and there, but you do more mischief than good to them as a class. I hope this matter will be well understood by the people, and that each gentlemen who votes for the bill may have to justify his vote before the people. If so, I do not think the next Congress will press through such a bill as this without discussion, and under the gag of the previous question, as they are determined to do this, if they can. I consider myself fortunate in getting this opportunity to put in a few words; and I promise that this shall not be the last that gentlemen are to hear from me on this question: for I mean that the country shall understand it fully.

I now, in accordance with my agreement with the gentleman from Tennessee, demand the previous question. I hope that the motion to reconsider will prevail, and that the bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, there to be considered upon its merits.

NOTE.

Many persons do not know how much they are taxed on account of the expenditures of the Federal Government. The amount now collected by reason of the tariff, or indirect taxes, is about sixty millions of dollars per year. If this sum be divided by two hundred and thirty-four, the number of congressional districts, it gives as the share paid by each districts, two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars. North Carolina has eight districts and a fraction over. She therefore pays, as a

State, of this tax, upwards of two millions annually. There were, however, some ninety thousand votes given at the last State election. It is therefore true, that the share of each voter in the State, upon an average, is twenty-two dollars a piece. This is not an unfair mode of stating the case, because the women and children, in fact, contribute little to the payment of the taxes. Such a county as Rutherford or Wilkes, therefore, pays about \$40,000 in each year. The actual loss is, in fact, much more to the people; for this sum of \$60,000,000 which the Government gets is, in the first place, paid by the importing merchants, and they charge a profit on the duty paid, as well as on the original cost of the goods, when they sell to the wholesale dealer; and he, likewise, puts on a large profit when he sells to the retail merchant; and this retail merchant usually adds not less than fifty per cent. when he sells to the consumer. It is probable, therefore, that the people of the county pay, in truth, twice as much as I have stated, in addition, too, to the very large sum paid by way of protection to the home manufacturer, which, on many classes of articles, exceeds greatly what the Government collects itself.

If this sum seems very large, it must be remembered that from one fourth to a third of all the money paid to merchants, and for articles brought from abroad, is to be charged to this tariff system. Many men pay hundreds of dollars per year in this way, when thier purchases are large without being aware of the extent to which they are taxed. It is probable that the people of North Carolina pay in this way to the General Government nearly ten times as much as they pay to support their State government.

If this money were collected as direct taxes are, by the sheriffs, it would be complained of in many instances, and members of Congress would perhaps be censured when they were found wasting money on their favorites, in cases where it was not called for by the public interest, but was wastefully and mischievously spent.

While I am willing to vote all the money that the public service requires, I am opposed to donations and largesses to favorites. My policy has been to reduce, if possible, the expenses of the Government, so that we may diminish the taxes on the people. I wish to reduce the tariff generally, if possible; but if this cannot be done, at least to repeal the duties on railroad iron, so as to enable the country to make improvements, and thus put the farmers and all others on a better footing, so that they can pay the taxes with less difficulty. Salt, sugar probably, and other necessities, have strong claims to be released from duties. If these subjects were properly understood by the people of the country, they would, in my opinion, compel ther members of Congress and Senators to lop off wasteful expenditures, and reduce the taxes.

[The following speech is presented, because some of the then belligerents are engaged in a war on the same theatre, and on grounds not materially different from those on which the former war was waged. And also because we have ourselves had since then a large experience of the effect of great expenditures of money for war purposes, and are, therefore, in a condition to judge all the better of the effect of such expenditures on the interests of humanity.]

SPEECH

IN FAVOR OF A PROPOSITION FOR MEDIATION IN THE
EASTERN WAR, DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
JANUARY 3, 1855.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. CLINGMAN said :

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the attention of the committee, not to the subject upon which my friend from South Carolina (Mr. Keitt) has so eloquently addressed the committee, for I should not like to attempt to glean a field which he has reaped so carefully, but to another question which has some intrinsic merits, and which I hope to be able to present in the interval that will elapse prior to the usual time of adjournment.

It will be recollected that, at an early day of this session, I offered a proposition, suggesting the propriety of this government offering its mediation to the belligerent Powers of Europe. The following is the proposition, as modified by me:

A Joint Resolution requesting the President to tender the mediation of the United States to the Powers engaged in the Eastern war.

Whereas, the people of the United States see, with regret, that several of the great Powers of Europe are engaged in a war which threatens to be of long duration, and disastrous in its consequences to the industrial and social interests of a large portion of the civilized world; and being, under the favor of Providence, in the full enjoyment of the blessings of peace, distant from the theater of conflict, disconnected with the causes of quarrel between the parties belligerent, and, as a nation, having no immediate interest in the contest, and no purpose to interfere, forcibly or in an unwelcome manner, nevertheless are of opinion that the controversy may be susceptible of pacific adjustment, through the intervention of a neutral and friendly Power; therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That we would view with satisfaction a tender to the belligerents of the mediation of the United States, provided it should be in accordance with the President's views of the public interests.

My object at that time was simply to get the subject before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am known to be a member, leaving it to the discretion of that committee to act upon it as to them

might seem best. Since then, there has been a great deal of comment upon that subject by the press generally. The proposition has been assailed in some quarters, and defended with ability in others. The course of remark has been such, that I desire to make a short explanation of my views in relation to this subject, and of the reasons which governed me in making the movement.

I do not propose to speak as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs now, because I have not the right, under the rules of the House, to refer to anything which occurs in the committee until it shall think proper to make a report to the House. I desire only to meet some of the objections which doubtless induced gentlemen to vote against the proposition at the time when it was first moved.

It is said, in the first place, by objectors, to be an intervention on our part with the affairs of foreign governments. If it be *intervention*, it is precisely *such* intervention as this government has practiced from its foundation. Every minister sent abroad is sent to influence the action of some foreign government, and to induce it so to regulate its action as to benefit, and not injure us. In point of fact, we have ourselves had several instances of mediation submitted to us, which we have accepted, thereby admitting that it was not such intervention as gentlemen would now exclude us from offering to foreign governments. Our ministers are instructed to interfere with the action of foreign governments, so far as it may affect us, and no further; and hence they are not expected to look to the internal action of any government, but merely to its external relations, because in these latter we ourselves have an interest. For example, if the Emperor of Russia should deprive us of the trade of the ports of the Black Sea, or Baltic, our minister, Mr. Seymour, would be instructed to remonstrate against it. If that interruption should arise from a conflict between Russia and some other Power, why then we might appeal to both of the belligerent parties. In this particular instance, our trade is interrupted in those seas by the existing war, and our government has a right to relieve us from such an injury, if it is practicable for it to do so.

A gentleman over the way said, the other day, when I first brought up this proposition, that he hoped that the war between Russia and the allied Powers would continue for fifty years. I take it for granted that he did not express this benevolent wish [a laugh] from any opinion that it was advantageous to the parties engaged in it; but he must have made the remark to carry the impression that the United States would derive some advantage from it. It will be conceded, on all hands, that it will give us no glory and no additional territory. If we are to be benefited, therefore, it must be in a pecuniary point of view, either by increasing our exports, that is to say, enhancing the value of what we have to sell, or diminishing the price of what we have to import or purchase.

Let us examine this matter briefly, at the outset of the argument, first with reference to what we have to sell.

Our principle article of export is cotton; and now, in the face of two short crops, it is down to less than eight cents. My own opinion is, and I say it with deference to the opinions of other gentlemen, that

but for the war, cotton would probably be now worth eleven or twelve cents, as it was in 1850 and 1851. I say so, because the recent supplies do not, I think, bear a greater ratio to the present demand of the world than did the crops in the years referred to. If so, the loss on this article alone, will make a difference of at least forty millions of dollars in the value of our exports; and, in point of fact, I have no doubt that the war makes a difference of from twenty-five to forty millions in this respect alone, besides losses in tobacco and other articles. Gentlemen will say to me, perhaps, that breadstuffs are increasing in value, but they forget that the drought of last year so destroyed the crops in most of the grain-growing States, that we shall have nothing to spare for the next twelve months. We have then to take the chances of deriving an advantage two years hence; if we should then happen to have produce to sell, as a set-off to the large and heavy losses that are falling on us.

But, in point of fact, it is the ability of Europe to purchase that determines the demand for and price of breadstuffs. I took occasion some years ago to examine the reports made by committees of the British Parliament in relation to the condition of the laboring population of England. It appeared that during periods of distress and famine the laboring classes were compelled to give up in succession, as the pressure increased, such articles as were not indispensable; and that, for example, they first gave up sugar, then meat, after using it for a time only once a week, then bread, and finally they relied upon the potato alone. It appeared, from the investigation made at that time, that there was a disposition to consume a large amount of provisions if they had had the ability to obtain them. Necessity was the sole measure of their purchases. If the war goes on in Europe, with its heavy taxation diminishing the wealth and means of the people there, I doubt very much whether they will have the ability, to any great extent, to pay for our produce, even if we should have a large surplus. But even if it should prove otherwise, it is not probable that this additional demand will make up for the loss upon the other articles to which I have alluded.

Again, specie is being rapidly drawn abroad from this country to satisfy the demands of the belligerents. There is, by consequence, an extraordinary pressure in the eastern cities, and extending itself into the interior of the country, so as seriously to cripple all business transactions, and produce heavy losses to the community. Stocks of all kinds have also greatly fallen in value, to the detriment of many of the States, as well as of individuals. Besides all this, the shipping interest has suffered, and is suffering extremely.

During the great wars in Napoleon's time, owing to the fact that Great Britain was excluded from most of the continental ports, our ships had the carrying trade. Such, however, is not now the case; but there are, in fact, nearly as many foreign ships engaged in trade as before the war began, owing to the fact that Russia has not the means of molesting the allies on the sea. In fact, while the number of carriers remains about the same, the absolute value of freights is likely to be diminished, so that really the whole shipping interest is languishing,

and the value of ships is twenty or thirty per cent. less than it was a few months ago. A gentleman behind me, from the maritime region, says that it has diminished fifty per cent. Doubtless he is right on this point.

It is also probable, if the war continues for years, we shall suffer as purchasers. It is true that certain kinds of manufactures seem to have fallen in value. It must be remembered, however, that the present supply was created for a state of peace. One of the effects of a fall of prices is to diminish the amount produced. It will also follow, that if laborers are forced to serve in the armies—and on this account, and also by reason of exorbitant taxation, manufacturing establishments are broken up—there must be a corresponding rise in the value of articles produced. These are not new opinions with me; for in 1850, I contended, while discussing the tariff, that one of the reasons why manufactures were so cheap, was that a long peace in England had caused the wealth and labor, formerly expended in wars to be employed in production, and thus brought down the prices of articles, and put them in the reach of a larger number. If this was a sound argument, as I still think, then the reverse, viz: withdrawing labor and capital from production, and expending it in war, will tend to raise prices in those commodities.

I refer to all these matters to show that our interests are suffering from the effects of this war; how much it is not easy to determine. My own opinion is from fifty to a hundred millions of dollars a year. I have no doubt that it is largely more than the expenses of this government. Now, if this be so, is it not worth while to see if any measures can be devised to remove the cause of such a loss?

But, it may be said that this is only temporary, and that matters will soon get right. On the contrary, it strikes me that these evils must continue and be permanent. England and France have already sent more than one hundred and fifty thousand men to the East. Now if they cost the Allies as much per man as our soldiers did in Mexico, it will be upwards of one thousand dollars per man for a campaign; and this, in the aggregate, amounts to one hundred and fifty millions. Besides this, they have already made an enormous expenditure of money for the naval armaments, both for the Baltic and Black seas. So that the whole expenditure may be nearly twice that sum. From the English papers, I observe that the British government is about building a hundred and twenty steam gunboats, at a cost of \$250,000 each. That item alone will amount to \$30,000,000. The Russian and Turkish expenditures are also very large, so that the entire war expenses must reach several hundred millions.

Now the money expended in this manner is as completely lost to the world as that invested in the Arctic when she went down into the waters of the deep sea.

It is supposed that the Allies have lost forty or fifty thousand men, including those who have been slain in battle, died of disease, or have been permanently disabled. The Russian loss is greater, especially if we take into account the campaign on the Danube. The same is probably true of the Turks. The loss of all must exceed one hundred

thousand men. Now, North Carolina is an averaged sized State, in population, and she has only one hundred thousand voters. There has then been a number of men destroyed as great or greater than all the voting population of my State—men in the prime of life, men selected for their bodily vigor, and many of whom were men of intellect and education. All these are swept away. The effect of the war is far more disastrous than any epidemic disease which sweeps over a country, and takes away a like number of men, women, and children, indiscriminately.

My object in making these remarks is to show that an immense amount of the wealth of the world, and a very large number of producers, as well as consumers of the products of our labors, are annihilated. I hold that such a loss is injurious to the commercial interests of every civilized country in the world, and especially to that of the United States.

To prove the truth of this proposition, let us suppose the United States to be the only civilized country in the world, and all the rest to be filled with savages, we should have then no exports and no imports. This is evident as soon as stated. As in that contingency, all our surplus productions would perish on our hands, I need not argue that this state of things would be immensely injurious to us. I maintain that as you destroy the wealth of the civilized world to any great extent, you approximate that condition to which I have alluded. For instance, suppose that other nations were thrown back to the condition of things that existed twenty-five years ago. We then sold less than thirty millions of dollars worth of cotton. If Europe were in the same condition as at that time, and we had now a hundred millions to sell, but could find a market for only thirty millions, where should we find ourselves? The extra amount of seventy millions would rot on our hands. But I take the further position, that even if this war, or any other cause, should keep the rest of the world stationary for the next ten years, we should be greatly losers, because we are constantly increasing our productions; and hence, if there should not be a proportionate increase in the markets of the world, we should be losers.

I think, therefore, that the proposition can be maintained as a sound one in political economy, that you cannot destroy a large amount of the wealth of the world, without injury to us as a great commercial nation. There may be exceptions to this rule here and there, but as a general proposition, it holds good. If then, the war be injurious to us, financially and commercially, will it benefit us politically? In reference to the question of the balance of power in Europe, it is true that it is not a matter for us to interfere with. But I may say that you could not change that balance of power without prejudicing us. For example, if Russia becomes omnipotent, and crushes the western commercial nations, though the Czar might be as just as and moderate as our own Washington, his successors might not be so, and it is easy to see that their conduct could change things to our injury. If the Allies, on the other hand, should prove decidedly victorious, their ascendancy might give them, not only greater power, but also greater inclination to interfere with us on this side of the globe. Looking, therefore, to

the mere question of the balance of power in Europe, you cannot change it without putting us in a worse condition than we now are. I hope it will remain evenly balanced, so that each Power may be able to hold others in check, and prevent mischief.

But having barely adverted to these topics to show that this war is an evil to us, I pass now to the consideration of the other great question. Is there anything in the attendant circumstances of a character to induce a belief that our country might exert an influence to bring the war to a close? This, Mr. Chairman, is a question of great delicacy, as it involves an examination of the grounds of the war itself. If I were to enter into a discussion of its causes, I should speak of things which persons in Europe, perhaps, understand better than I can do here. In the next place, I might get up such a debate as would lead to a discussion of the merits of the several contending parties, and put ourselves in a position which neutrals ought not to occupy. I therefore feel the full force of the caution given by the old Roman poet, to those who tread on ashes that may conceal fires underneath. Nevertheless, I desire to make a suggestion or two on this point.

The war originally rested upon a very narrow basis, so small that the parties themselves did not expect it to produce a war. This is clear from their procrastination and tardiness in making adequate preparations for so great a contest. In fact, it was supposed, at one time, that they had settled the difficulty. The Czar himself is represented to have said that the war is one "for which, judged by its apparent grounds, there is no reason; and it is contrary to the moral, industrial, and commercial interests of the entire world." It is true, that he goes on to charge that the purpose of the allies is to limit the power of Russia. Well, if that be their purpose, of course any offer of mediation from us would most probably lead to no favorable result. But I do not understand that the allies have planted themselves upon that ground as yet. And even if they have for a moment entertained such notions, the formidable resistance they have met with when attacking what was supposed to be the exposed point of the Czar's dominions, will go far to satisfy them that it is not an easy matter so to change the map of Europe as to deprive Russia of any portion of her territory. I do not believe they will persist in any such purpose. They are governed by wise and sagacious statesmen; and, in view of the difficulties which present themselves, I do not think they entertain the idea that, without a longer struggle than either of these governments are willing to make, they can materially diminish the power of Russia.

All history shows that the apparent strength of alliances is deceptive. Where all the parties are acting in good faith, and with equal zeal, it very frequently happens that, from the want of proper concert of action, they fail to accomplish their object. All Europe at one time assailed France unsuccessfully, and Napoleon himself, at a later day, carried most of the European nations with him against Russia, but his reverses caused Austria and other Powers to secede and join his enemies, so that he was in the end overwhelmed. I take it for granted, therefore, that these sagacious statesmen will not rely so fully on

this alliance, powerful as it seems to be, as to press the matter to the extreme I have alluded to.

It does not strike me, Mr. Chairman, that it is the interest of either of these Powers to desire a prolongation of the war. England is a commercial nation. The English people are brave, and energetic, and patient and so long as their government tells them it is necessary to carry on the war they will submit to sacrifices. But England can have no hope of acquiring territory, so as to compensate her for these sacrifices. This remark applies equally to France. Her Emperor seems to have been directing his energies of late very much to the improvement of the interior of his own country, in all respects, and to the beautifying of Paris, its magnificent capital. I do not, therefore, believe that the Allies will at present desire to prolong the war. And very clearly it cannot be the interest of Russia to have war rather than peace. The Czar of Russia has a territory twice as large as that of the United States. It is but thinly settled, and the facilities of communication between the different parts of it are not such as they should be. He marches men a thousand miles from Moscow to the Black Sea or the Danube, and they are decimated two or three times over by disease and fatigue, ere they reach the point of action. Now, you and I know very well, sir, that railroads from Moscow and St. Peterburgh to the Danube, the Crimea, and the Caspian, would make Russia stronger now than she would be with the whole Turkish empire annexed, without these facilities. I take it for granted that a sagacious ruler, like the Czar, would rather improve the condition of his country, in this respect, than prolong such a war. Great Britain is just the reverse of Russia in this respect; and by reason of her compactness, insular position, and maritime supremacy, she is a formidable antagonist to any country under the sun, having one league of sea coast.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that there were some mistakes made originally. I think it highly probable that the parties took the successive steps that led them into this war without foreseeing where they would carry them. The Emperor of Russia may not have expected such an alliance when he took possession of the Principalities, and the Allies probably thought he would recede when they made their demonstration. But, sir, they have now placed themselves in a position where neither can well make the first move towards a settlement, without a sacrifice of pride, and perhaps of prestige. Their condition is well described by Vattel, in a few sentences, which I will read to the committee. He says:

“Two nations, though equally weary of war, often continue it merely from the fear of making the first advances to an accommodation, as these might be imputed to weakness; or they persist in it from animosity, and against their own interests. *Then* common friends effectually interpose, offering themselves as mediators. And there cannot be a more beneficent office than that of reconciling two nations at war, and thus putting a stop to the effusion of blood. This is an indispensable duty to those who are possessed of the means of succeeding in it.”

These sentences, Mr. Chairman, express fully what I would say on this point. But if the contest be not terminated now, it must soon become a general European war. It will next year probably get into Germany and Italy, and be more destructive than the wars of Napoleon, because the means of aggression and destruction are greater at this time than they were in his day. When the tri-colored flag is on the Danube or the Vistula, the impetuous glory-loving Frenchman will have brought back vividly the recollections of Marengo, and Jena, and Austerlitz, and Wagram. All Europe will be in a blaze, and the war will fall with destructive and crushing force on the industrial and lower classes, who, in such times, are always the greatest sufferers.

There are some who look with hope and pleasure to this condition of things. They say that the governments will be overthrown, and the cause of liberty advanced. I have no doubt but that some of the existing governments will be put down, but I do not concur in the opinion that republicanism will gain. You may see one tyrannical government overthrown, and another, stronger and more tyrannical, erected in its stead. The only liberty which is worth preserving, is that which is founded upon law. And from the days of Julius Cæsar down to the present time, "arms and laws have not flourished together." On the contrary, during military struggles, despotism raises its head and dominates over the land amidst the clangor of arms. To protect life and property, power must be given to the existing governments. The greater the perils which surround them, the higher the powers with which they must be invested. Men will submit to any exactions, therefore, to support vast military armaments. But let there be peace and security, and these very armaments, being no longer necessary to the safety of the State, soon become intolerable and will be discarded.

Sir, the history of modern Europe sustains this position. It was after a long period of peace that the first French revolution exhibited itself, and at the close of the long and desolating wars to which it gave rise—I mean when the Congress of Vienna sat—liberty lay low all over Europe. It was after a long period of peace that the revolution of 1830 shook down the French monarchy, and extended its vibrations into distant Poland. It was after another long period of peace that the revolution of 1848 blazed out in France, illuminating Lombardy, Italy and Hungary, until its light was dimmed and extinguished by the smoke of battle.

Sir, our neighbor, Mexico, has had war enough in the last fifty years to have made her people the freest on the earth, and yet, though many tyrannical governments have been put down there, the cause of civil liberty has not advanced. Nor has it in the South American States; nor in the world generally, during hostile struggles. What I mean to say is, not that war may not be sometimes necessary to protect liberty, but I affirm that liberty does not usually spring out of war; that where you have one case of that kind, I can point to a hundred of a contrary tendency. Looking, therefore, simply to the interest of the masses of Europe, I would rather have peace than war. In peace you have the railroad and telegraph and the newspaper. Every newspaper and

letter, and message is an atom thrown on the side of liberty. You will find that as men become wealthier they will become more intelligent and more tenacious of their political and personal rights.

These views, Mr. Chairman, accord with our own political system. We have the smallest army and navy of any of the great nations, and our policy has been that of peace, in the main, from the days of Washington. There are, too, passages in our own history, which render it imperative that we should make the movement which I have indicated. It is well known that during our revolutionary struggle, France interfered on our side, and ultimately became our ally, and aided us until the end of the struggle. But for that intervention it is highly probable that the assembly which I am addressing to-day would not exist. And, sir, while alluding to this, I find myself unexpectedly in the presence of one who calls up recollections; I cannot see at this moment, without emotions, the gentleman on my left. (Mr. Clingman looked at M. Lafayette, who was sitting near him.)

A voice. "Who is it?"

It is, (said Mr. Clingman, continuing,) he whose grandsire is pictured on that tapestry, (pointing to the full length portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette, on the left of the Speaker.) When we remember the past, made vivid by the sight of that picture and this living representative, is there one who can doubt but that we owe a deep debt of gratitude to France. While I would not pretend that we ought, under the circumstances, to take part, by force, on her side, I nevertheless maintain that we are under the highest obligations to do everything consistently with our own interest, to relieve France from danger or difficulty.

At a later period in our history, when we were at war with England, in 1812, Russia tendered her mediation. That mediation was, in the language of Mr. Monroe, the Secretary of State, "willingly accepted" by our government. Great Britain declined it, but subsequently, and after she had triumphed over her great adversary in Europe, and was prepared to turn all her forces against the United States, and thus give the war a much more serious and formidable character, it is well known that the interference of Alexander of Russia contributed, in a powerful manner, towards the pacification which took place. Russia, too, it appears, then, has strong claims to any good offices we can render her.

Still later in our progress as a nation there is an incident, and a precedent more striking and conclusive in its character. In 1835, when this government, under the administration of General Jackson was in imminent danger of being involved in war with France, Great Britain tendered her mediation. It was accepted, both by us and by the King of France, and a pacification between the two governments was the result. Upon this point I cannot do better than to read a few sentences from the work of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, (Mr. Benton). After alluding to the state of things which then existed—the exhaustion of negotiations and the preparatory armaments on both sides, he refers to the fact that General Jackson sent in a message to Congress, announcing his acceptance of the mediation, and uses the following language:

"In communicating the offer of the British mediation the President expressed his high appreciation of the 'elevated and disinterested motives of that offer.' The motives were, in fact, both elevated and disinterested; and present one of those noble spectacles in the conduct of nations on which history loves to dwell. France and the United States had fought together against Great Britain; now Great Britain steps between France and the United States to prevent them from fighting each other. George III received the combined attacks of French and Americans; his son, William IV, interposes to prevent their arms from being turned against each other. It was a noble intervention, and a just return for the good work of the Emperor Alexander in offering his mediation between the United States and Great Britain—good works these peace mediations, and as nearly divine as humanity can reach;—worthy of all praises of long remembrance, and continual imitation;—the more so in this case of the British mediation when the event to be prevented would have been so favorable to British interests—would have thrown the commerce of the United States and of France into her hands and enriched her at the expense of both. Happily the progress of the age which, in cultivating good will among nations, elevates great powers above all selfishness, and permits no unfriendly recollection—no selfish calculation—to balk the impulsions of a noble philanthropy."

These, Mr. Chairman, are just and noble sentiments in themselves, and concisely and handsomely expressed. Andrew Jackson, then at the head of our government, was not a man likely to succumb to an adversary, or to admit improper interference from a foreign quarter. Nor did any man in these halls, or in the country, censure his acceptance of the mediation. Every one knew that the *iron will*, before which the veteran columns of England were broken to pieces at New Orleans, would have been not less strikingly exhibited in defense of any right that could claim the protection of our flag.

It thus appears that each one of these three great Powers has, in periods of trial or danger to us, interfered for our relief; and shall we not reciprocate their good offices? Shall we be always ready to receive benefits, and never to return them? Shall we fold our arms and coolly look on, while our former friends are struggling in the midst of perils? Above all, shall we refuse to act because we hope to take benefits from their misfortunes? Is a great government like ours to occupy the position of the wrecker, who stands upon the sea beach during the storm, praying that navies may be stranded, that he may seize upon the floating fragments? Shall we imitate the kite and the vulture that follow armies to prey upon the slain, or the sharks that collect around the sinking ship to devour the drowning inmates? If any gentleman here has such feelings, I envy him not their enjoyment.

If we were, as a nation, too feeble to protect ourselves, we might, upon the plea of necessity, justify being thus contemptible. We might then have an excuse for wishing that others might be crippled lest they should hurt us. But while in a war with any great maritime power our commerce would seriously suffer, there is no nation in less danger of conquest or mutilation. We can, therefore, afford to be just and honorable, yea, even magnanimous.

There is another reason, Mr. Chairman, which operates with great force on my mind as an argument for my proposition. The impression prevails in Europe, or, at all events, has been sought to be created there, that we are a grasping and rapacious people. I do not, for a moment, admit the justice of this charge against us. On the contrary, I think the United States have shown, from their earliest history, a commendable moderation. I recollect very well being told by a gentleman who had just returned from Europe, whilst the Texas annexation was pending, that the veteran statesman Metternich said to him, there was not a government in Europe that would have hesitated a moment to take Texas on the terms on which she offered herself. In fact, while England has been taking kingdom after kingdom in Asia, and France has been extending her conquests over Africa, and the other European governments have been taking all the territory they could acquire without peril to themselves, we may well challenge a comparison with them.

I may say, further, in order that no gentleman may misunderstand the feelings with which I make these remarks, that I belong to what is called the party of progress, or to Young America. I am in favor of the acquisition of territory under proper circumstances. Nevertheless, while I entertain these opinions, and believe that injustice has been done to our country abroad, it is impossible to conceal the fact that the impression prevails in Europe that we desire this war to continue, in order that we may get an opportunity to seize upon our neighbor's territory. Now, by making this movement we shall truthfully, and at the same time, gracefully remove any such impression. Besides, sir, it would be a declaration of neutrality in the most emphatic form. It would not only be a declaration that our government intends to stand neutral, but that it did not desire that the war should continue to the injury of the parties themselves. If the movement were to be successful, if we were to be instrumental in relieving these belligerents from their present difficulties, it would give us the greatest consideration, not only with the governments, but also with the masses of the people.

I maintain that if our country and its government becomes popular with the people of Great Britain and France, and with the other nations of Europe, the monarchs would not like to quarrel with us in opposition to the wishes of their subjects. But where there is ill-feeling between countries a single spark will sometimes light the flames of war.

I have, Mr. Chairman, discussed this question mainly upon the narrow ground of our interests as a nation. This, however, is not the mode to do full justice to the subject. To do this will require a much wider range of thought and investigation. Independently of all calculations of interest, considerations of humanity rise up and force themselves upon the mind. The earth was given to man for his dominion and control. But it is only in our times that men are beginning to assert that right in its full extent. I do not mean to say that in former ages men have not been spread over the earth, but it is only in our day that they have begun to turn its great natural agents to account.

This war will stop the progress of humanity. It will destroy the greatest and best works of man, and throw him back upon the barbarism of the past.

Besides, it is a war between the different branches of the great Caucasian family—the white races of men, who have shown by their superior mental and moral endowments, their right to control the world and regulate its destinies. It is also a war, in the main, between Christian nations; and we are impelled, therefore, by considerations of humanity, of race, and of religion, to interpose, if our interposition can avail anything. If the movement is to be made, it should begin here. We represent the feelings, the very heart of the American people; hence our sanction will give greater force and consideration to the movement. But to the Executive, who has the charge of conducting the foreign affairs of the country, it belongs properly to decide when and how the step should be taken. If there be not a fitting occasion just now, it may be otherwise a few months hence.

Entertaining these feelings, my original object was to bring the subject before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and let that committee determine whether such a movement was advisable; if it were, to let it begin with Congress, but leave to the Executive the mode and manner of conducting it. The President, of course, has an acquaintance with the condition of things which nobody else can possess, and to him, therefore, would I leave it to determine whether the movement should be made now or at some future day, and whether the offer of mediation should be tendered through the foreign ministers here or through our ministers abroad, or in any other mode that he might regard as best calculated to effect the object. Whenever he should think proper to act, he would then move in the matter with all the authority of the government to sustain him. If the movement shall be made, I have no doubt but that it would be sanctioned and approved by our constituents.

The state of feeling developed in the Northern States during the latter part of the years 1854 and 1855, satisfied me that the anti-slavery movement could not be checked by argument, and that it would, if only thus opposed, result either in a dissolution of the Union or a civil war. It seemed that a foreign war offered the only mode of averting it. While I would not have thought it right to encourage a war upon an innocent country for such a purpose, yet if there were a country that had given us abundant cause to make war against it, I was willing to resort to that step to avert the danger which threatened us. Especially would this be justifiable, if that country were itself, by its action, the chief instigator of the movement to produce a civil war among our own people.

For example: If a man, without cause, attempts to kill me in the streets, it is universally admitted that I may even kill him in self-defense. But will any one deny that if a man were industriously furnishing poison to my servants, and urging them by all possible means to poison me, I would not be equally justified in using force to counteract his efforts. Such a case as this was presented by the action of

Great Britain. Its history for the last two centuries shows it to be, in a worldly sense of the terms the *wisest and wickedest* government that has hitherto existed on the globe. For its own selfish purposes, it with great industry for a series of years worked steadily to effect the destruction, or at least the crippling of the United States.

It was clear to my mind that we had a perfect right to interrupt her movement against us, if necessary, by going to war with her. In such an event, her agents and allies, the Abolitionists, would have taken sides with her, and thus by arraying the national feelings of the country against them, they would have been rendered as powerless for mischief as was the old Federal party by its opposition to the war of 1812.

Even if no war should follow from the movements that I favored, as least the public attention would have been directed to foreign questions rather than to a domestic controversy. The administration of President Pierce, however, could not be induced to look in that direction.

When the slaughter of some of our citizens occurred at Panama, I made a most earnest appeal to him personally, and also to Mr. Marcy, the Secretary of State, to induce them to take steps to occupy the isthmus of Panama, for damages, and pay the government of Grenada a pecuniary consideration by way of boot, for it. This matter was subsequently referred to in the House in my speech of May 5th, 1858. Also, when the case of the Black Warrior occurred, I, in connection with the Hon. John Perkins, of Louisiana, made an effort to induce the government to take decided action, but to no purpose.

With respect to this last transaction, as a different impression was at that time sought to be made, it is due to the truth that I should explain what actually did take place in that connection. I do this the more willingly because Judge Perkins and Mr. Davis are both living, and if they think proper can add their recollections to mine. It is perhaps also right that I should do so, because I have in conversation several times spoken of the transaction. Soon after the message of the President was read, Judge Perkins and I had a conversation on the subject. We were both members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and concurred in our feelings with reference to the matter of the message. At his request, after the adjournment of the House I repaired to his lodging, then near the corner of Fourteenth street and Pennsylvania avenue. We jointly prepared resolutions in response to the calls in the message, for means to defend the honor and interests of the country. Judge Perkins kept all the papers, and I can only speak from memory as to their precise terms. In substance we proposed to authorize the President to make use of the army and navy, to accept the service of fifty thousand volunteers, and make an appropriation of ten millions in money. I may not remember the numbers precisely, though I cannot be mistaken as to the substance of the proposition. After the resolutions had been fully written out, Mr. Perkins being, as well as myself, well pleased with them, suggested that before we had them proposed in the committee they should be communicated to the administration. I earnestly objected to this, because I apprehended that the administration, not being really in earnest, would endeavor to strangle the proposition. Though I insisted that we ought to take the message as conclusive of the President's wishes, yet Mr. Perkins said he did not feel willing to press them through the committee, without first submitting them to the President, &c.

He expressed the greatest confidence that all would be right, and said that by eleven o'clock in the morning he would be in the committee room prepared to press

the resolutions. The committee met at ten o'clock, and remained in session till eleven o'clock without his appearing. I kept them occupied with some little matters till twelve o'clock, hoping that he might come, but in vain. When the House met I sought him without finding him in his seat. It was not until nearly two o'clock that he appeared. On my going to him and asking why he had failed to come to the committee, he said: "Why, that matter fell on them up there (referring to the White House) like a *coup d'état*." "What do you mean?" I enquired. He answered, "They said nothing would be more embarrassing to them than such a movement in Congress, and entreated me not to urge it." Subsequently he told me that the matter was discussed for two or three hours, Messrs. Pierce, Marcy and Davis being all present.

Some other things occurred in this connection which at this time I do not think it necessary to state, without the permission of Judge Perkins. They, however, in no wise tend to reflect on him, but, on the contrary his action was in all respects praiseworthy.

I was of opinion at that time that a war with Spain, England, and even France, (though I did not believe that she could be gotten into it) would not cost us a tenth of the men and money that a civil war would do.

In connection with the foreign affairs of the country I refer to an incident which led, perhaps, to a publication subsequently made. Crampton, the British minister, had been detected in what was supposed to be a violation of our neutral position in the Crimean war. While his case was the subject of controversy, I saw President Pierce and suggested that as England was sensitive and very averse to his dismissal, it would be politic to waive the matter, provided we could, in exchange for so doing, obtain a substantial concession as to Central America. He and Mr. Marcy, either from anger, or, as I then thought, to make political capital for the next Presidential race, insisted on Crampton's dismissal. On the evening after this occurred, I met at a party both the Count de Sartiges, the French minister, and Baron Stockl, the Russian. I saw at a glance on meeting them that the French minister was exceedingly disturbed and very much depressed, while the Russian ambassador was elated and jubilant. These circumstances were too significant to fail to make an impression.

On the next morning I called at the war office and said to Mr. Davis, the Secretary, that in saying what I was about to do, I wished him to understand that I did not myself believe any serious difficulty would result from the dismissal of Crampton, but that two persons who ought to be better posted on that subject than I could be expected to be, evidently thought differently, or at least seemed to believe that something might grow out of the transaction. I then stated to Mr. Davis what I had observed, and asked him in the event of war with Great Britain what would be our means of defense in California. I stated that we could easily march men across the continent, but that we could not transport heavy ordnance, and asked him if there were a sufficiency of heavy guns at San Francisco to resist an attack from the sea. He at once concurred in the view that it was important to enquire, and he immediately sent for Colonel Craig, the Chief of Ordnance. When he came in it was ascertained that the means of defense were insufficient, and he directed that a quantity of heavy ordnance, with the necessary stores, should forthwith be sent by sea to San Francisco.

[It became more and more evident that the next presidential contest, as far at least as the Northern States were concerned, was to be made to turn upon the slavery issue. To defeat such a movement it seemed necessary that the Conservative feeling of the country should be strengthened as much as possible, and united on a single candidate. As our opponents would show a solid front against us, it was our plain duty likewise to unite for the common defence. As too, our adversaries derived a large part of their strength from their alliance with the British Abolitionists, and such powerful aid as the English press daily gave them, it seemed of the utmost importance that this combination should be exposed and thereby its influences weakened as much as possible. With that purpose, I prepared and published a paper, directed to my own constituents, but which was intended for general circulation, and which in fact was used to some extent in other States. In it a contrast was drawn between the action of Great Britain in its dependencies, and the condition to which it reduced its subjects, especially in India, and that of the laborers in the Southern States of our Union, and some points were made with a view of arraying the feelings of our countrymen against the British movement and policy.]

It seemed that by exposing the injustice of the Abolitionists towards us, and at the same time rendering their great ally odious to our people, an union of all the conservative elements of the country might be effected. With this purpose, the address which follows was published.]

ADDRESS

TO THE FREEMEN OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, ON THE POLITICAL CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE COUNTRY.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: Many letters have, during the present session of Congress, been received by me containing inquiries in relation to the present political condition of the country and its future prospects. Not only in my own district, but elsewhere throughout the South, there is doubt and anxiety in the public mind. In my judgment, there are good grounds for apprehension; and I adopt this as the most appropriate mode of communicating my views to you, and shall speak with that frankness that I am accustomed to use when discussing political topics in your presence.

That the ultimate destiny of our present political system will be determined by events soon to occur, is most probable. If the perils which threaten it are properly understood by the people, they will be averted, and we may well hope for a long career of prosperity under our existing form of government. The danger which now menaces the existence of the Federal Union arises from feelings of hostility entertained in the North towards the Southern section, and especially the institution of negro slavery as it exists among us. To indicate fully the nature of the evil which impends, it may be necessary to review some points that have already been brought to your notice by

myself and others in former discussions. So great is the interest involved, however, in the question, that you will, I know, fellow-citizens, pardon some recurrence to familiar topics.

When the Constitution of the United States was originally adopted, twelve of the States were slave-holding, one of the old thirteen only having abolished the institution. In forming the Constitution, therefore, no power was given to the general government to interfere with slavery in the way of abolishing it, or even restricting it to any particular territory or limits, but each State retained its former right to act for itself with reference to the subject. The only powers given the Federal government were plainly bestowed on it for the protection and defence of the institution in such of the States as desired to retain it. It is provided that slaves should be represented in Congress, so as to increase the weight of the slave-holding States; secondly, that all such as might run away should be restored to their owners; and, thirdly, that for the period of twenty years Congress should not prevent the importation of such additional slaves as the States might desire to add to their existing numbers. It was thus manifest that, while ample power was given the government to defend slavery as long as any one State might desire to retain it, there was allowed to it not the shadow of authority to abolish, or even to assail, the institution.

For thirty years after its adoption the provisions of the Constitution were maintained, and under their operation some of the Northern States having in the meantime sold most of their slaves to the Southern people, to whom such property was worth more than it could be in the North, abolished the system, while several new States, both free and slaveholding, had been admitted into the Union. The Federal government, in the meantime had properly abstained from all interference with the subject. In the year 1820, the State of Missouri offered herself for admission into the Union, with a Constitution recognizing slavery. The application met with violent opposition from the North. This was owing to the course of certain leaders of the old Federal party. In such of the Northern States as had abolished slavery there was a feeling against it. As the difference between white men and negroes had not then been much noticed or understood, it was not difficult to enlist the sympathies of the people there in favor of the slaves of the South; and the leaders, therefore, of a party that had been overthrown and rendered odious, by inflammatory appeals in favor of universal liberty, and denunciation of the slave power of the South, aroused a strong feeling throughout the entire North, so that a body of representatives were returned from that section hostile to the application of the new State, though her Constitution was, in respect to slavery, similar to those of a majority of the old States. After an exciting struggle, an act was passed proposing to allow Missouri to come into the Union, but declaring in one of its clauses that in all that portion of the Louisiana Territory that lay north of the parallel of $36^{\circ} 30'$ slavery should never exist.

By the old French and Spanish laws, which had been in operation over the entire territory, slavery legally existed in every part of it, and

this was in law, if not in fact, an act of abolition. Southern men, however, from an extreme anxiety to procure the admission of the new State, unwisely and weakly consented to support the measure, and were willing to purchase for Missouri what she could claim as a right under the Constitution. The restriction was supposed by Southern men, however, to have entitled her to come into the Union; but at the succeeding session of Congress, when she applied with her republican Constitution, the body of the Northern representatives still resisted and rejected her, in accordance with the instructions of most of the Northern States. Hence it became necessary for new concessions to be made, and an additional price paid to the North; and Mr. Clay came forward with his compromise, requiring Missouri to do certain other humiliating things before she could get into the Union. In this way, with the aid of six or seven Northern votes only, she was accepted, in the midst of a general storm of opposition from the North. Since the prohibition of slavery north of $36^{\circ} 30'$ was originally offered as a consideration for her admission, and as such was not accepted by the free States, but a new price required, it would have been right for the South to have likewise repudiated the act of prohibition. Nevertheless, impelled by a strong desire to have peace and harmony, the exclusion was acquiesced in by her, while the North complained and denounced the act. The anti-slavery feeling gradually subsided there, and the country remained quiet until a new influence was brought to bear on it.

Great Britain had acquired, by the force of her arms and skill in diplomacy, immense possessions in Asia. Her East Indian provinces alone contained more than one hundred millions of people, held in a state of most abject slavery, and oppressed by much greater hardships than the negroes of any part of the United States.

To make this appear—and because British writers are constantly denouncing the slaveholders of the South for their immorality, barbarity, and cruelty—and because the Abolitionists in this country are in the daily habit of praising everything in England, and holding up her conduct for us to imitate—it will not be amiss for me to present some facts. Eighteen months since the British Parliament was forced, by the pressure of public opinion, to send out to India a commission to inquire into the manner in which the people were treated there. That commission, after examining hundreds of witnesses, has recently made its report; and I find the substance of it given in the January number of the *Edinburgh Review* for the present year. It must be borne in mind, that in that country the government owns the land and compels the people to work it, exacting as much as one-half, and, it is said, even two-thirds, of the entire product of the farms. It is difficult—almost impossible, indeed—to collect such enormous rents. As a means, however, of exacting it, torture is habitually applied. I present a few extracts from the article of this periodical—a publication as reliable as any in Great Britain:

“The tortures which the commissioners find to have been employed are of various kinds and of different degrees of severity. Some of them are so light

as to amount to little more than a menace. Some are so severe as to cause not only extreme present pain, but permanent injuries, mutilations, and even, not unfrequently, death. Some of them exhibit an amount of diabolical ingenuity on the part of the torturer, and a degree of moral abasement and degradation in the victim, of which our western minds can hardly form a conception; some, in fine, are so loathsome and indecent, at the same time so execrating, that, although they are set down nakedly in the report, we must abstain from any specific allusion to their nature.

"The two most common forms of torture appear to be the *kittee* (in Teloo-goo called *cheerata*) and the *anundal*, which, in the same language, is called *gingeri*.

"The *kittee* corresponds with the thumbscrew of the European torturer. It is a wooden instrument, somewhat like a *lemon-squeezer*, between the plates of which the hands, the thighs, (in women also the breasts,) the ears, and other more sensitive parts of the body, are squeezed to the last point of endurance, often to fainting, and even to permanent disablement. In many places the *kittee* has been superseded by the more simple plan of violently compressing the hands under a flat board, on which a heavy pressure is laid, *sometimes even by the peons standing upon it*; or of compelling the sufferer to interlace his fingers, and deliver him over to the iron gripe of the peons, (or policemen,) who sometimes rub their hands with sand, in order to give them a firmer gripe. In other cases the fingers are bent back until the pain becomes unendurable.

"Occasionally a man is held aloft from the ground by the ears, by the hair, and even by the mustachio; and the latter torture, in some instances is applied so savagely as to tear away the mustachio by the roots. Sometimes a sort of bastinado is inflicted; sometimes violent blows on the shin, the ankles, the elbows, or other highly sensitive points; prolonged immersion in the water tanks or the river; forcible compression of the arms, the thighs, and even the body, by tying a coil of coir rope around them, and then applying cold water, so as to cause it to contract and sink into the flesh; burning it with hot iron; hanging heavy stones around the neck; the stocks; tying two or more individuals together by the hair, so that every movement is attended with pain.

"Will it be credited, for example, that it is not uncommon to apply to the most sensitive parts of the body (enclosed in a cloth or a cocoanut shell, or other similar receptacle) a *biting insect or reptile*, such as the poolah, or carpenter beetle, and leave it to gnaw the flesh of the miserable sufferer?—that, by a further refinement of cruelty, meant to combine both pain and humiliation, the defaulters are sometimes tied by the hair to the tail of a donkey or buffalo?—that they are occasionally hung up with the head downwards?—and that it is an ordinary practice to put pepper or powdered chillies into the eyes or the nostrils, and to apply these and similar irritating drugs in other ways too revolting to be hinted at?"

There is a long and frightful detail of a great variety of tortures, which the reviewer declares, show "an amount of hateful ingenuity," which it is difficult to conceive or believe, but that they are given in the report. After detailing many shocking cases of the dying of men under these various forms of torture, and of "women, by having the "*kittee applied to their breasts*" to enforce the collection, sometimes, of a *few pence only*, the commissioners confess that "the infliction of such descriptions of treatment as they had described has come, in the course

of centuries, to be looked on as customary—a thing of course—and to be submitted to as an every-day, unavoidable necessity.”

Though these details have recently been spread before the British public, they seem to have created no sensation, because, doubtless, the sufferers are not negroes, but of a race regarded as Caucasian, like the English themselves.

Such is the condition of an empire whose example we are denounced for failing to imitate, both by the British press and its Abolition allies in this country. Under this system, grinding and monstrous as it is, the whole population is rapidly perishing in many of the provinces, and the most fertile lands are becoming desert wastes. These miserable laborers are mainly engaged in the cultivation of tropical productions, to supply the demand of the markets of Great Britain and those of her customers. It was soon seen, however, that, owing to the superior skill and energy of the planters of the South, they were able, by means of slave labor, to produce cotton, sugar, rice, &c., at lower rates, and thus undersell similar articles grown in India. The British government likewise held certain islands in the West Indies, cultivated by negro slaves, but as the amount of her interest there was comparatively small, she determined to sacrifice it for what she regarded as a more important object. She accordingly emancipated her negro slaves in the West Indies, and thereby reduced the islands to a state of unproductive barbarism. She then set in motion a system of operations to force the United States to emancipate her slaves in like manner, expecting, if this was accomplished, to be able to supply the world at her own prices with tropical productions from her great eastern possessions. This, however, was not the sole motive that influenced her conduct. The United States was her great commercial rival, and it was then seen that, owing to our more rapid increase, we should soon surpass her, as in fact we have already done, in the amount of our tonnage. The prodigious growth of our commerce arises from the fact that while the South, by its successful agriculture, has furnished the freights, the North has built the ships to carry them to market; and it was obvious that we should soon successfully contest the mastery of the seas with her. Her policy, therefore, was to separate the ships of the North from the productions of the South; and this would have been the case if she had succeeded in effecting the abolition of slavery, so that the South would cease to have a surplus for export; or even had she failed in this, the same result would have been attained by a dissolution of the Union. In this latter event, the North and the South being foreign countries to each other, the shipping of the one would have derived no advantage from the agriculture of the other, and Great Britain would have held the dominion of the ocean. There was another consideration operating on the English government and a portion of her people with more force than either of these.

The United States is the great Republic of the earth, and the example of our free institutions was shaking the foundations of the monarchical and aristocratic governments of Europe. This was especially the case as respects the political system of Great Britain, owing to our common language, literature, and extended commercial intercourse.

The aristocracy there hold the mass of the people in subjection, and under a condition so oppressive that large numbers of white men of their own race are liable to perish miserably by famine in years of scarcity. A knowledge of the successful working of our institutions was increasing the discontent of the common people, and, fearing the loss of its sway, the aristocracy, which controls the entire power of the government, began a crusade for the abolition of slavery in the United States. They expected, in the first place, by affected sympathy for the negroes here, to divert the minds of the people at home to some extent from the consideration of their own sufferings, and to create the impression that other laborers were much worse off than their own. And should they succeed in breaking up our system, they would exultingly have pointed to it as evidence against the durability of free institutions.

With a view, therefore, to effect these objects, more than twenty years ago the British press and book-makers generally, were stimulated to embark in a systematic war against negro slavery in the United States. Abolition lecturers were sent over, and money furnished to establish papers and circulate pamphlets to inflame the minds of the citizens of the Northern States. Looking far ahead, they sought to incorporate their doctrines into the school-books and publications best calculated to influence the minds of the young and ignorant. Their views were most readily received in Massachusetts, where there were the remains of old anti-slavery federalism, and where the British influence has for the last half century been greatest. From this State these doctrines were gradually diffused, to a great extent throughout the North. When the annexation to Texas took place, so strong were the manifestations of the anti-slavery feeling, that Southern members consented that the Missouri line, or the restriction of slavery north of $36^{\circ} 30'$, should be extended across the State. On the acquisition of the Mexican territory occurred that struggle which is too well known to require comment. We of the South, during a period of four years, taking conciliatory ground, sought to have the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ in like manner extended through the territory to the Pacific, but the North invariably opposed and defeated it, and a settlement on different principles was adopted in 1850.

Two years since, when the act organizing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska was passed, it repealed the restriction of 1820, known as the Missouri line, and left the people who might inhabit those Territories at liberty either to adopt or reject slavery, as they saw fit. This was right in itself, and in accordance with the principles of the Constitution. Nor was there any ground whatever for the complaint of its enemies, that it violated an old compromise, because the North, the very year after that restriction was adopted, refused to recognise it as a compromise, on all occasions afterwards repudiated it, and utterly refused to extend its operation to the new Territory. But it is sometimes said that, though the repeal of this prohibition was right in principle, yet it was inexpedient, and has created agitation. In my judgment it was a wise measure, and the agitation to which it has given rise would have occurred on any other practical issue that

might, sooner or later, have arisen. And if the strength of the anti-slavery feeling in the North is so great that such a measure cannot be sustained under the circumstances of its passage, then that feeling has already attained a power that will most probably be fatal to the continued existence of the government. On the other hand, the success of its principles will give permanent repose to the country.

When the bill was yet pending before Congress, the Abolitionists, and others who sympathized with them held large meetings, and declared that if it became a law they would raise money and hire bodies of men to go into the new Territory and exclude slavery from it. They accordingly formed societies, and collected large sums of money, and sent off a great many persons to control the elections in Kansas. Finding, however, that they were defeated by the settlers in the first instance, they continued to forward large bodies of Abolitionists and other ruffians, armed with rifles, cannon, and the like weapons. They avow it to be their purpose to take possession of and hold the Territory by force, without regard to the laws passed by the Legislature. In pursuance to this determination, they have pretended to form a State Constitution for themselves, and, stimulated by their leaders in the northeast, declare it to be their purpose to resist the laws already in force in that Territory. The President, therefore, in accordance with his duties as prescribed in the Constitution, has taken the necessary steps to see that the laws are enforced. It is, therefore, not at all improbable that a bloody collision may occur in the Territory between the traitors employed by the Abolitionists and the friends of the Constitution and laws. That such an occurrence is to be greatly regretted cannot be denied by any real patriot. The responsibility must rest on the Abolitionists, in spite of the efforts of some of their secret allies to charge it on the authors of the Kansas and Nebraska bill. If a body of infidels should enter a church and create a disturbance, it might as well be said that those who had built the church and attempted to worship in it were responsible for the mischief, as that the legislators of the last Congress are to be blamed for the efforts of those wrong-doers to defeat the operation of the law.

Whether a collision occurs there are not, in nowise affects the importance of the great issue to be determined by the country during the next twelve months. The coming presidential election is more important than any which has occurred since the organization of the government.

Should the party of the Constitution triumph, it is probable that the anti-slavery feeling of the North, under the enlightening discussion which is taking place, aided by time for reflection, will subside, and allow the government to move on in the even tenor of its way. But should our adversaries succeed, it is hardly to be hoped that our system would long survive. If any one imagines that they would stop with the restoration of the Missouri line, or any other partial measures, he is grossly deluded. The objects which the managers have in view is the total abolition of slavery, the raising of the negroes to equality with us, and the amalgamation of the white and black races, and, by consequence, the destruction of our society and the ultimate certain

extinction of the hybrid race. Nothing less than this will satisfy our enemies on the other side of the Atlantic. In a late number of the *London Telegraph* such expressions as these occur :

"The aggressive spirit of the people of the United States requires an humbling, and it is for us to perform the task. England's mission is to complete the great work commenced by her in 1834, when she liberated her slaves. There are now over three million human beings held in cruel bondage in the United States. If, therefore, the United States government deny, and is resolved to question the right of Great Britain to her Central American possessions, we the people of the British empire, are resolved to strike off the shackles from the feet of her 3,000,000 slaves. And there are those among us who will sanctify such a glorious cause."

There is, too, a complete understanding between our enemies in Great Britain and their allies in this country.

The *London News*, another leading British paper, in a late issue says truly, in reference to any difficulty that might arise between this country and England, that "however strong is the unprincipled appeal at present made to the anti-British feeling of the Northern States, that feeling is counterbalanced by another, which has grown up within the last quarter of a century. *The Abolitionists would be with us to a man. The best of them are so now.*"

Even in this country, it must be borne in mind that, however moderate may be many who are now acting with the anti-slavery party, the leaders are thoroughly hostile to us. I know a number of the Abolition managers, and they are with a few exceptions, not more unprincipled than they are envious and vindictive. Being equally cowardly, mean, and malicious, they intensely hate whatever is honorable and manly in the human character, and nothing would be more gratifying to them than to see the Southern men and women whom they have so long villified degraded to the level of the negroes. Long observation has satisfied me that envy and malice have more to do with the abolition movement than fanaticism. That they will ever be able to effect their objects I have no fears. We have a population of more than ten millions, or four times as large as the old thirteen colonies had at the breaking out of the revolution; while the North, even if united, (which it is not likely it would be) would be less strong than Great Britain was. Though we should be able to protect ourselves, and might have every reason to hope for a long and successful career as an independent Republic, yet I hold that we are under the highest obligations to use all proper means to preserve the existing Federal government. We now, after a period of thirty years of wrong, stand in a position of equality with the North, and we owe it to ourselves, to those who are to come after us, and to the cause of liberty, truth, and honor, never to lose that position. The increasing unanimity of feeling among our people, and the growing determination never to submit again to be degraded to an inferior station, give the gratifying assurance that any successful attempt to reduce us will merely be followed by the destruction of the government making the effort. Yet no one can justly charge us with seeking undue advantage in the

Union. At this time the President of the United States is a Northern man; so is the President of the Senate, or Vice-President *de facto*; so likewise is the Secretary of State, the minister at the most important foreign court, and also the Speaker of the House of Representatives; yet there has been no complaint of these things by us, except as to the last, who stands on avowed principles of hostility to our section. On the contrary, our course has shown that, provided simple justice was done us in matters of principle, we were willing to concede all that could be given up without loss of honor.

As it is our high duty to make a fair effort to maintain, if possible, the existing union of the States, what ought we to do in the approaching presidential contest? Let us take a survey of the field of action, and of the combatants in it. The old Whig party (as, you remember, I predicted some years ago would be the case) no longer exists. For the last twelve months it has not had friends enough in any one State of the Union to raise a banner in its name. Its former members have either gone into other organizations, or are waiting to take some new position. In the North most of them have united with the Abolitionists and free-soil Democrats, and formed a sectional party which is held together mainly by its hostility to the South. In fact, its only leading principle is "anti-slavery." It has adopted the designation of "Republican party," though it is more commonly called the Black Republican party. The latter designation is the more appropriate, not only because, while it is devoted to the elevation of the negroes, it ignores, disregards, and contemns the rights of white men, but also, because it is a *counterfeit*. Mr. Jefferson once said that the old Federalists would attempt to get into power by stealing the name of Republican, and his prediction has been verified in our day. The leading principle of our revolutionary struggle, and also that of the old Republicans of Jefferson's day, was the question of the right of the people in each locality to govern themselves; and this great privilege is now denied by this party which seeks at the same time to deprive the white men of the Territories of the right of self-government, and to put negroes on a level with them, and thus to raise the latter to a higher station than God Almighty has fitted them for. If their policy could be carried into practice, you and I know, fellow-citizens, that the experiment would merely end in the degradation and destruction of the white race. The candidate of such a party whoever he may be, can have no claims to your support.

A second association, whose candidate is already in the field, is the Know-nothing or American party. Twelve months ago it seemed to be formidable in its organization and numbers. When assembled in convention, however, last June, it is well known that, on the adoption of its platform condemning further slavery agitation, the delegates of twelve Northern States, wherein its strength chiefly lay, seceded from the party. In the recent convention of last month, however, these same delegations came back, and succeeded, by a large majority, in repealing and striking out the identical section which they had objected to, and obliged Southern members, in their turn, to leave the convention. It then nominated Fillmore and Donelson for the first and second

offices of the government. Mr. Fillmore, it is conceded, has no strength in the North. This is in part owing to the fact that he, in accordance with a plain constitutional provision, placed his signature to the fugitive-slave act, and subsequently, in obedience to his official oath, endeavored to carry it out. He has been so generally repudiated, that I have not heard the first individual express the opinion that he can get a single electoral vote in a free State. In the South he has stood on much better ground; but his position on the pending questions is unknown, and he is essentially weakened by being the nominee of the Know-nothings, should he accept. In fact, if he be a member of the order, as seems to be established, he would, if elected, be bound by his oath, to carry out the wishes of the grand council, in which the North has the control. Waiving, however these objections, there is another which is controlling. Even if Mr. Fillmore should carry the several Southern States claimed for him, he could not thereby succeed. The only effect of dividing the Southern vote would be to throw the election into the House of Representatives. The recent election of Speaker by that body shows what would be the result of a presidential contest. If the so-called national Know-nothings had voted for our candidate, Governor Aiken, he would have been certainly elected. Even if he had received on the last ballot the five votes of that party which he did get on the day previous, he would have beaten his competitor, Mr. Banks, an avowed Know-nothing—not to speak of three others, two of whom were from slave States, who might have been counted on. Should the presidential election devolve on the House, there will either be no election at all, or the Black Republicans must succeed. It seems quite probable, therefore, that the Northern delegates in the Know-nothing convention permitted Mr. Fillmore to be nominated to effect this result. As they were able to repeal the old platform, they evidently had strength enough to have defeated him, and it seems probable that they got out of the way, or connived at his nomination, to give the Black Republican candidate a double chance, so that, if he should fail before the people, he might succeed in the House. As votes, therefore, given for Mr. Fillmore, under such circumstances, would merely be thrown away, it is not probable that, even in the South, he will carry a single State.

The great antagonist, therefore, of the anti-slavery party must be the nominee of the Democracy. That party has been essentially modified within the last few years. In its Convention of 1852 it adopted for the first time a recognition of the resolutions of the Virginia Legislature of 1798, the embodiment of the creed of the old Republican party of Jefferson; and, subsequently, it has affirmed most strongly, on all occasions, principles sustaining the rights of the South and the equality of the States. While thus acting, however, during the late struggles, so many of its former members left it that it is conceded that it would have been beaten in almost every State in the Union but for the assistance of patriotic Whigs who have marched to its support. Encouraged by these accessions, standing firmly on the principles of the genuine Republican party of the olden time, and conscious that the destiny of the country depends on its action, it is marshalling its ranks,

and is ready to go into battle with unusual ardor, and a confidence worthy the great cause in which it is engaged. Is it not entitled to the support of all conservative and patriotic men?

Let us, fellow-citizens, examine this point calmly and fairly. I will first address myself to the members of the old Whig party. You, as such, are, of course, not under the slightest obligation to go for the nominee of the Know-nothing convention, because that convention denounced both the Whig and Democratic parties as corrupt, and proclaimed that it had "arisen on the ruins of both and in spite of their opposition." But some of you may feel reluctant, after having acted against the Democratic party so long, to go into a union with it. To show that this can be done with propriety, and without any loss of self-respect, let us recur to the past action of our own party in the State. After the right to elect the Governor was conferred on the people, the first nominee of the Whigs was Edward B. Dudley, who had formerly been an old Jackson Democrat. Their next nominee for the same office was John M. Morehead, who used to declare in his speeches that he was one of the old Jackson captains, and that he had three times been on the Jackson ticket as elector. Surely, when the old Whig party took up these men and elected them, it did not suppose that they had done wrong in going from one party to another. The two last senators representing the Whigs were Messrs. Mangum and Badger. But Mr. Mangum was originally elected senator by the Jackson party, and after he changed ground and united with the Whigs, he was twice re-elected by them to the Senate. Mr. Badger, too, was at one time chairman of the Jackson central committee of the State, but after he joined the Whigs this did not prevent their twice electing him to the Senate. These things show that, in the judgment of the Whig party, a man's changing his associations from good motives did not render him unworthy of the highest confidence. When Mr. Clay was before the people of North Carolina in 1832, he only received some five thousand votes; yet in 1841 he carried the State by a decided majority—showing that about half of its citizens had changed their position. I might multiply instances as to both parties in all the States. It is the highest duty of a patriot to act according to the existing circumstances for the good of his country.

But if some of you should feel a strong repugnance to act with the Democratic party, remember that, when you were most opposed to it, Martin Van Buren was its executive champion, Thomas H. Benton was its Congressional leader, and Francis P. Blair the editor of its official central organ. These men are now, with many others like them, outside of the Democratic party, and hostile to it. Will you join these persons in making war on the *true men*? This is the position of things; that the old Democratic party is divided now, and you must, therefore, decide whether you will act with the free-soil wing or the sound republicans. This is the real point for you to decide. Will you allow old prejudices to influence you on so great an issue? If you were, as jurors, about to decide the pettiest dispute between two of your neighbors, you would be ashamed to let prejudice against one of

them influence you in the slightest degree; and when the great interests of the country are at stake, will you be less fair?

I would, in the next place, address a few words to you who are members of the American or Know-Nothing party. Twelve months ago there seemed to be a gulf almost impassable between you and those with whom I am acting. In the first place, yours was a secret political organization, which required its members to deny knowledge and conceal certain truths. This was regarded by us as demoralising and mischievous in the extreme, but the objection is said to have been removed by the abolition of all secrecy. In the next place, your members were bound by obligations to vote as the councils, &c., might direct; and this was regarded by us as directly hostile to the right of suffrage in the citizen necessary to self-government; but this has, at least, in many places, been abrogated, and all tests and obligations are said to have been annulled. A third great objection was the interference in religion in the proscription of Roman Catholics, &c.; but this, too, has generally been abandoned; and the last grand council at Philadelphia, by a majority vote, admitted the Roman Catholic delegates from Louisiana. These three great barriers have, therefore, already been broken down. What remains, then, of your peculiar views? An amendment by Congress of the naturalization laws. Admitting, for argument, that this may be a matter of importance, surely you will agree with me that it is not to be brought in comparison with a question of the existence of the government itself. Had you not all rather that our system should move on as formerly under the existing naturalization laws than be brought into serious peril? What would you think of a man who, when his dwelling had taken fire, instead of attempting to extinguish the flame, should occupy himself with removing insects from it? Ought we to imitate the conduct of the Jews, who, when their city was besieged by the Roman army, continued to wrangle and dispute with each other until it was taken and destroyed?

But you say that you do not wish foreigners to hold office in this country. In point of fact, they do not hold as many of the offices as their proportional numbers might entitle them to. After all, however, is it not more important that the offices should be filled with persons who will discharge the duties than that any particular set of people shall have them? How many of the fifteen thousand voters in our district are likely to hold office? I have no doubt but that at least five hundred men were induced to join your organization in our district by such representation, and perhaps no one of them will realize the possession of any desirable office. The truth is, this clamor is kept up by a few designing office-seekers in the country, who hope, by these means, to derive advantage; whereas the great body of the tax-paying people have no interest beyond a good administration of official duties.

Certain politicians are clamorous against some of the appointments of the present administration. It may be true that the President, like some of his predecessors, has made a mistake in this respect; but is this to be weighed against the bold and patriotic stand maintained by him and his friends in defence of the rights of the weaker sections of

the Union? I know, gentlemen, that many of you feel politically hostile to me, on account of our past collisions, but you cannot charge me with having ever deceived you. Recollect that more than twelve months ago I told you in my speeches that the Know-nothing party would be broken up and destroyed soon after the meeting of this Congress. What was then predicted is now history. I told you that the body of its members from the North were anti-slavery men, and that their action would drive you out of the party, and earnestly exhorted you to await the developments of one year, and in the meantime to stand aloof from the organization. Do you not wish that you had taken my advice? I do not expect you to admit this to me; but I put it to your own consciences, when you are in communion with that Supreme Being your council professes to reverence, do you not regret your connection with the order? Perhaps you may feel offended with me even for this, just as, formerly, some complained of my announcing in advance the destruction of the old Whig party, or of my public declarations just before the last presidential election that General Scott could not get more than four States, as the event afterwards proved. But you cannot charge me with the want of any fairness and candor; and, as on all former occasions, I now speak to you with the frankness and directness that becomes a freeman addressing his peers. Remember that, if earnest, I am asking nothing for myself. On the contrary, when a candidate before you, I have scorned to make any appeal to your favor. On such occasions you have complained that my tone was defiant and denunciatory. But I *will appeal* to you for the life of the Constitution.

With respect to those persons who formerly acted with the Democratic party, I can see no reason for their now withholding their support from it. It has thrown off the free-soilers in the North, and gotten rid of some bad elements in the South, and now stands fairly as an organization by the rights of all sections of the Union. In fact, its principles of action are those of the old Republican party of the days of Jefferson, which meet with universal approbation in our portion of the confederacy.

We are called upon, fellow-citizens, one and all, to make a manly stand for the Constitution and the rights of our section. If beaten, we may be forced to declare independence, to maintain equality and honor. In submission, we should have in prospect the condition of a conquered province, with no rights but such as were accorded by the mercy of the victors. As those who lead our assailants are the meanest and most contemptible of men, so they propose the destruction of our state of society, and the lowest degree of social degradation known to humanity.

When you are about to decide an issue of such moment, heed not the words of a few mercenary traitors among us. They have marks upon them by which they may be known. They are the men who see no merit in the past sacrifices and eminent services of the patriotic Cass, so happily termed the "Nestor of the Senate." They witness, without one cheer of applause, the unceasing blows of the heavy battle-axe of Douglas, wielded in our defence from morn till eve, and

from year to year, untiringly and continually, as the billows of the ocean dash against its shore. They chuckle like fiends when it seems that Franklin Pierce and the granite Democracy of New Hampshire are about to be borne down by our enemies, so as no longer to be able to shield us from danger. But the true men in the Northeast, though for a time overpowered, return to the contest with renewed zeal. Remembering that, though the British armies once had possession of their territories, the spirits of their ancestors were unbroken, and that the revolution failed not, they rally again and boldly proclaim that the battle for the Constitution "has only begun." Pennsylvania,

Collecting all *her* might, dilated *stands*,
Like Teneriffe or Atlas,

across the entire breadth of the way, and says to fanaticism and treason, "Hitherto shalt thou come but no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed." The young giants of the Northwest, lamenting that they were not old enough to have marched under the banner of Washington, press eagerly forward to take the front of the column if any of the Old Thirteen should falter in the hour of trial. On every side there are coming up the brave and true for the decisive struggle.

Many a party banner has risen and stooped again; but there is a flag which has never yet gone down before the eyes of mortal man. It first shone in the sunlight on the 4th of July, 1776; and though it wavered in the dark hours of the Revolution, it went not down, but kept its place, and still has kept, through many a stormy period since, on land and sea. The old flag of the Republic now looms high over the field of danger, summoning its friends to gather around it. There is only one of the political organizations that can stand under that banner. And will you leave the Democratic party, weakened in former contest for the right, to fight this great battle unaided, and alone to triumph, or alone to die, in such a cause? Where will you be found, gentlemen when such a field is to be fought and such a banner is to be upheld? Look back into the past, and see that in the olden time the enemy approached our section only to be repulsed. The mountain peaks which looked down on the rapid flight and destruction of Ferguson's army, still stand silent but impressive monitors. Though, of the bold riders who dashed through their gorges and forests, only the last linger yet a little while, the memory of their deeds is immortal, and will again kindle the flames of patriotism to future triumphs. A victory in this contest saves the Constitution from danger, overwhelms its enemies, and gives the highest assurance that our magnificent ocean bound Republic will continue for ages to run a career so bright and glorious as to challenge the wonder and admiration of the world.

Respectfully,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, *March* 16, 1856.

After Mr. Buchanan's election, I had a conversation with him in regard to the foreign policy of his administration, to commence on the coming fourth of March. I regretted to find that he had weakened greatly, and did not appear then willing to stand by the policy of the Ostend manifesto. In fact, on my praising it in high terms to him, he seemed disposed to qualify it, and rather to explain away some of his strongest points. I told him that I would, before the close of the session, speak on it, and that I felt confident that it could be placed in a most favorable light before the American people. In the hope that he might be strengthened in his feelings and induced to maintain bold American ground the speech which follows was made:

SPEECH

ON BRITISH POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND CUBA,
DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEB-
RUARY 5, 1857.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. CLINGMAN said :

Mr. Chairman : My purpose in rising to address the committee to-day is to call the attention of gentlemen to a subject of some practical importance at this time, and of great moment in the future of this country. One of its points is already understood to be undergoing examination in the other end of this capitol ; and I hope some of these days to bring another important branch of it to the consideration of the American Congress. Before referring directly to these points, however, I desire to offer some general observations which nevertheless have a direct bearing on them.

Much is said, sir, of fillibustering ; and when the British newspapers read us lectures on our propensities in that respect, some of our own people hold up their hands in horror at the prospect presented of the moral depravity of the country. It is undoubtedly true, that since the commencement of our existence as a nation we have extended our territory from a little less than one million of square miles to about three millions. How stands the case with Great Britain ? The whole island, including England, Scotland, and Wales, has an area of eighty-nine thousand square miles, and yet the entire dominion governed by this island includes territory to the extent of nearly eight million square miles ! While we have added two hundred per cent. to our territory, she has acquired about nine thousand per cent. We have increased three-fold in area, she ninety-fold ! And yet she is shocked while witnessing our rapacity for acquisition, and complains that the American eagle is a " fast fowl "—a greedy bird. What, then, shall we say of the appetite of the British lion ? Why, her possessions in North America alone are more extensive than all the territory of the United States. Her Australian dominions are themselves, likewise, greater in area than all we hold. In the East Indies, on a territory larger than the settled parts of the United States, she controls despotically a population of one hundred and forty millions.

Besides these, she has her provinces, islands, and military and naval stations in every sea, and on every shore. It used to be the boast of Spain that the sun did not set upon her empire; but whichever side of the globe be turned to that luminary, and at any hour of the twenty-four, it never fails to send its rays down on a section of the British empire larger than all the United States. Nor have her efforts to expand her domain been relaxed in view of her immense acquisitions, but on the contrary they are at this very time being pressed forward with great zeal, both by the government and its subjects.

They denounce us for our alleged failures to maintain a strict neutrality towards other countries; but this Government was the first to pass laws on that subject: and our statutes are more strict, I think, and have been better observed, than those of most countries. In Great Britain they are liable at any time to be suspended by the will of the Crown; and, in fact, bodies of many thousand men have been organized without objection in and about London, to carry on wars in the Spanish Peninsula and elsewhere, while the Government professed to be at peace with the parties assailed. Indeed, companies have been chartered by the Parliament to carry on what would in these days be called filibustering operations. The East India and Hudson's Bay Companies are examples. The people of the United States are assailed because a few individuals have gone down into Central America to aid Walker. What would they, then, say of us, if Congress should charter a company, the "Transit Company," for example, and furnish it men and money to conquer and hold Central America for our benefit? And yet such an act would be following the example of Great Britain in chartering and upholding the East India Company, and enabling it to conquer and enslave a people five times as numerous as the whole population of the United States.

Our territorial expansion has indeed been remarkable; but so has been our progress in all respects. Our tonnage equals—probably exceeds—that of Great Britain herself. We have changed the system of maritime law for the world; and Britain no longer boasts of possessing the empire of the seas.

Already has been verified, in part, the prediction of Pownal, the sagacious Englishman, who nearly a century ago said:

"America will come to market in her own shipping, and will claim the ocean as common—will claim a navigation restrained by no laws but the law of nations, reformed as the rising crisis requires."

"America will seem every day to approach nearer and nearer to Europe."

"The independence of America is fixed as a fate. She is mistress of her own fortune—knows that it is so; and actuate that power which she feels, both so as to establish her own system, and to change the system of Europe."

"America will become the arbitress of the commercial world, and perhaps the mediatrix of peace and of the political business of the world."

So remarkable has been our progress that these wonderful prophecies seem like the offspring of inspiration. Great Britain has herself, too, by her conduct, verified another striking prediction, that the sovereigns of Europe—

“When they shall find the system of this new empire not only obstructing but superseding the old systems of Europe, and crossing upon the effects of all their settled maxims and accustomed measures, they will call upon their ministers and wise men, ‘Come, curse me this people, for they are too mighty for me ;’ their statesmen will be dumb ; but the spirit of truth will answer : ‘How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed ?’”

Great Britain has exhibited the feelings here depicted, and has resisted our progress with a perseverance, a skill, and an energy creditable to her ambitious sagacity, if not to her justice and magnanimity. Latterly she has directed her efforts, in the first place, to prevent our acquiring territory ; and, secondly, to render that territory, if acquired, a source of weakness rather than strength. It is to her policy on these two points that I now, Mr. Chairman, ask the attention of the House.

Holding as she does herself the entire northern half of this continent, she easily bars our progress in that direction ; on our eastern and western borders are the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. Our only field of extension, therefore, lies to the south, and her efforts are perseveringly and energetically directed to that quarter.

The Central American question has been prominent before the country for some time past. Great Britain acquired her foothold there in direct contravention of her treaties with Spain, to whom the whole of that region originally belonged. In 1763, however, she agreed by treaty to demolish her fortifications, &c., and cease to interfere with the rights of Spain, &c. As this treaty failed to secure the country, however, from British occupation, a more stringent one was made in 1783 ; and three years later, in 1786, additional articles were ratified. As these are all substantially the same, I read a clause from that of 1786 :

“ARTICLE 3. Although no other advantages have hitherto been in question, except that of cutting *wood for dyeing*, yet his Catholic Majesty, as a greater proof of his disposition to oblige the King of Great Britain, will grant to the English the liberty of cutting all other woods, *without even excepting mahogany*, as well as gathering all the fruits and produce of the earth, purely natural and uncultivated, which may, besides being carried away in their natural state, become an object of utility or commerce, whether for food or for manufactures ; but it is expressly agreed, that this stipulation is never to be used as a pretext for establishing in that country any plantations of sugar, coffee, cocoa, or other like articles ; or any fabric or manufacture by means of mills, or other machines whatsoever, since all lands in question being indisputably acknowledged to belong of right to the Crown of Spain, no settlements of that kind, or the population which would follow, can be allowed. The English shall be allowed to transport and convey all such wood and other produce of the place, in its natural and uncultivated state, down the rivers to the sea, but without ever going beyond the limits which are prescribed to them by the stipulations above granted, and without thereby taking an opportunity of ascending the said rivers, beyond their bounds, into the countries belonging to Spain.”

“The seventh article of the same treaty again provides for the ‘entire preservation of the rights of the Spanish sovereignty over the country, in which is granted to the English only the privilege of making use of the wood of various kinds ;’ and it goes on to stipulate that the English ‘shall not meditate any more extensive settlements’ than the one defined.”

It would be difficult to make a stronger stipulation against British encroachments than is here contained. Yet, though its enforcement was attempted to be secured by periodical visits of Spanish commissioners, it, like its predecessors, proved wholly ineffectual. As late as the year 1814, all these old treaties were renewed between Great Britain and Spain, and were at no time abandoned by the latter; and yet, in the face of such solemn engagements, the former has established her present position in Central America. For a full detail of the means she has used, I refer gentlemen to a work published in 1850 by Frederick Crowe, a Baptist missionary from England to Honduras and Guatemala. With the indignation of an honest, upright man who blushes for his country, he details the expedients and shifts to which British officials have resorted to obtain the control and actual dominion of Honduras and Mosquito coast, in such passages as the following :

“Nor is this the only national disgrace and absurd exposure which has resulted from the British protectorate on the Mosquito shore. Several writers have already noticed the humiliating scenes to which the coronation of the present line of Waikna monarchs have given occasion; and all the witnesses, except, perhaps, some whose sense of decorum and moral rectitude were little or not at all superior to that of the poor deluded Indians themselves, concur in branding these ceremonies, not only as ridiculous in the extreme, but as disgusting exhibitions of human degradation, and impious profanations of the name of God, which has been wickedly associated with them. Indeed, it is not a little surprising that Government officials—civil, military, and ecclesiastical—laying claim to reason and sensibility, (to speak of no loftier endowments,) could at any time be found willing to lend themselves to mockeries so puerile, and to deceptions so palpable and gross. But some such have ever been found ready to take a public part in the desecrations of the so-called religious forms, and in the name and on behalf of royalty, to place in the least imposing light imaginable,

“ ‘The low ambition and the pride of kings.’

“On such occasions, British men-of-war have been employed to convey the royal person, and the naked and barefooted nobles composing his court, to and from Jamaica, or British Honduras. A titled colonial bishop has been in requisition to consecrate and anoint with holy oil the semi-savage, the tool of governmental schemes of national aggrandizement. The various native lords, generals, admirals, and captains, have been clad for the occasion in gay regimentals, which they wore shirtless on their tawny skins, and so caricatured the ‘soft raiment’ that even the pencil of a Cruikshanks could scarcely do justice to their attitudes and grimaces while writhing under the confinement of braided coats, military stocks, tight boots, &c., &c.

“The coronation of King Robert took place at Belize on the 23d of April, 1825. None of the above elements were then wanting, except that the part of the Archbishop of Canterbury was performed by the chaplain of the settlement in the room of his superior, whose absence was more than atoned for by other details of the pageant. On this occasion it was deemed necessary to *qualify* the Waikna nobility for the part assigned them, viz: swearing allegiance to their King, by first placing them within the pale of the national establishment. Consequently the ‘ministration of baptism to such as are of riper years’ was superadded to the ‘coronation service,’ and the poor savages

having assented with becoming docility to all they were asked, were deemed capable of taking an oath, and their ecclesiastical disabilities were once for all removed. Mr. Henry Dunn informs us, upon the testimony of an eye-witness of this iniquitous imposture, that 'they displayed a total ignorance of the meaning (!) of the ceremony; and when asked to give their names, took the titles of Lord Rodney, Lord Nelson, or some other celebrated officer, and seemed grievously disappointed when told they could only be baptized by simple Christian (?) names': and he adds, that 'after this solemn mockery had been concluded, the whole assembly adjourned to a large school-room, to eat the coronation dinner, where the usual healths were drunk, and these poor creatures all intoxicated with rum—a suitable conclusion to a farce as blasphemous and wicked as ever disgraced a Christian country.'(!)"

He describes an interview with another of these kings, in the following passage :

"Skipper Mudge, who arrived at this port from Honduras last week, in his smack *Nancy*, reports that he had an interview, before sailing, with his Majesty the King of the Mosquitoes. His Majesty wore a splendid cocked-hat and a red sash, and had very large gilt spurs buckled about his ancles; but I regret to say that the remainder was, as the painters say, without drapery. We must make allowance, however, for the difference of customs and climate. His Majesty, who cannot be more than twenty years old, was slightly intoxicated. His suite consisted of a one-eyed drummer-boy, and two gentlemen with fifes, one of whom acted as an interpreter. The King of the Mosquitoes received Skipper Mudge seated on an empty whisky cask. He motioned to the skipper to take a seat on the ground, or wherever he chose.' The writer then goes on to describe the further proceedings of the interview, in the course of which his Majesty's laughter having been excited, the cask rolled from under him, and he fell to the ground. This is the monarch whose coronation at Jamaica figured in last year's (English) estimates."

Such are the means, as detailed by one of her own subjects, that Great Britain has used to get control of the Mosquito coast.

Referring to a charge made against the English movements in Honduras, Mr. Crowe says :

"In order to judge of the truth or falsehood of the charge of rapacity, let the reader briefly review the facts upon which it is founded.

"With no other claim than what is afforded by the treaties with Spain, we have possessed ourselves of the actual sovereignty of territories on the northern shore of the Bay of Honduras, extending over about twenty thousand square miles, or twelve million eight hundred thousand acres, exclusive of islands and keys.

"We have taken and retaken the important Island of Roatan no less than five times, and are now exercising the right of sovereignty over its fertile lands, which extend at the least to one hundred and fifty square miles, or ninety-six thousand acres.

"By virtue of a late treaty with one of the contending parties in Yucatan, and on the score of assistance afforded for the pacification of the peninsula during the war of races, which is still raging there, we have obtained an extension of limits on the northern boundary of our Central American empire, extending from the Rio Hondo to the port and town of Salamanca de Baca-

lar, thus including about three thousand six hundred square miles, or two million three hundred and four thousand acres of additional territory. Altogether, making, on a moderate calculation, full twenty-three thousand seven hundred and fifty square miles, or fifteen million two hundred thousand acres—which it nearly, if not quite, four times the extent of the Island of Jamaica.

“To the *occupation* of these extensive tracts of country must be added the *protection* of the Mosquito shore, over which our Government exercises as much control as over its own possessions, though in a somewhat less direct manner, or rather, by a more direct course. In addition to four hundred miles of sea-coast from the Roman river to the San Juan del Norte, we have lately put forth a claim, in the name of the Waikna monarch, to about one hundred miles more of sea-coast to the southward of the San Juan, extending through the State of Costa Rica and a part of the Province of Veragua, as far as Chiriqui Lagoon; thus including altogether at least thirty-seven thousand square miles, or twenty-three million six hundred and eighty-three thousand acres of PROTECTORATE, including the occupation of Greytown.

“Thus, as the actual result up to the present time, exclusive of such smaller items as Roatan and Tigre Islands, we have a sum total of sixty thousand six hundred square miles, or thirty-eight million seven hundred and eighty-four thousand acres, over which we exercise full control, being nearly a third of all Central America, and more than two-thirds the area of Great Britain.

“Let the reader now decide whether or not we must appear to the natives in the light of ‘a rapacious nation.’ To them it matters little whether our encroachments and our occupation of their country be defended on the plea of a ‘right of conquest,’ founded on the successful defense of St. George’s Key in 1798, or whether we are unprincipled and shameless enough openly to take advantage of circumstances, by replying to the remonstrances of the neighboring republics, that our treaties were made with Spain and not with them; and to the claims of Spain, that they have no further dominion over these territories since their late colony became independent.

“The natives cannot but consider these territories as a part of their country, which ought to be as free from the dominion of European monarchical government as they are themselves. It must weigh little with them whether we ground our claim to the Island of Roatan upon its first practical seizure, or on the fact that some fifty years ago we located upon it the remnant of a nation which we had well nigh exterminated in despoiling them of their native isles. The Central States, as well as the British government, know it to be, commercially, the key to the navigation of the Bay of Honduras, and must feel it inconveniently near to their own shores, while in the hands of a power so aggressive and so much their superior. In the magnanimous protection extended over the Mosquito shore, and in the residence of Mr. Coates, as British Commissioner to the Waikna King, they can discover no benevolence or philanthropy. If they had been inclined to forget the former attacks made upon the River San Juan del Norte, they could not now be expected to view with placid indifference our occupation of its best port, which commands the line of oceanic communication, at the very time that this grand project is most likely to be realized.

“In the occupation of British Honduras and Roatan, the protectorate of the Mosquito shore, the annexation of Tigre Island, the seizure of the ports and inlets in the Gulf of Fonseca, the blockade of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Salvador and Honduras, in the bearing of British officials, and in the tone and tenor of diplomatic relations, the Central Americans can perceive little besides ‘*La loi et le raison du plus fort*’—the law and the logic of

the stronger party ; and what wonder that, writhing under the grasp of the iron hand of oppression, they should mutter in their torture, ‘Rapacious nation!’ ‘Vandals of the age!’”

It was thus that, in defiance of all treaty obligations, Great Britain advanced steadily towards the occupation of Central America until the discovery of the gold mines in California. At once there was a rush of our people towards that land, across the Isthmus and through Central America. It instantly became manifest that this whole region was in danger of becoming Americanized, and that our eagle, in his flight from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would there find a resting-place. Up to this time, Great Britain had the advantage, but suddenly the scale was turned in our favor. In passing from one part of our territory to another, we were likely to occupy the intermediate ground. England at once changed her tactics.

In the year 1850 our Cabinet was more feeble and imbecile, as a whole, than any that the country has ever been blessed with, and, as such, it was easily entrapped by British diplomacy. The so-called Clayton-Bulwer treaty was the result. It provided that the United States and Great Britain would neither, directly nor indirectly, “occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America.” This treaty, according to the construction put upon it by Great Britain, which she has maintained in fact, left her in the full possession of the territory there which she had already seized in violation of her stipulations with Spain. In substance, therefore, it simply declared that, as Great Britain had possession of the principal part of the coast and the territory most valuable, she should continue to hold it; while the United States, *having nothing*, agreed that they would *acquire nothing* there. As long as this treaty should stand, so long would Great Britain have to populate, improve, and fortify the territory held by her. When she had thus become so strong there as to be able to control the destinies of that whole region, if the treaty were annulled, the United States, not having one foot of ground, would have been in no condition to contend with her, and hence Central America would inevitably have become one of her possessions as completely as Canada is at this day.

I see it stated in the newspapers, Mr. Chairman, that there is a project on foot to amend this treaty. Though the particular additions and qualifications suggested may be improvements on the original treaty in some respects, yet, as they rest on a foundation which is unsound and treacherous, I hope they will never be sanctioned by this Government as published. The original Clayton-Bulwer treaty must be got rid of. Possibly it might be well to add a proviso, that at the end of five years, for example, the whole, both of the original and supplemental articles, should become void. We might afford to submit to a bad treaty for a time, with a certainty that we were soon to be relieved from it.

Emboldened by a success in this movement which could hardly have been looked for, the next step in English diplomacy was the proposition for the tripartite convention in relation to the Island of Cuba. The British Government, in conjunction with that of France, on the 23d of April, 1852, proposed to the United States that the three Governments

should jointly and severally agree that no one of them should ever acquire the Island of Cuba. The administration of Mr. Fillmore declined the arrangement; and the dispatch of Mr. Everett, the then Secretary of State, has been much commended for its ability. That the reasons why the United States could not be expected to consent to such an arrangement are ably and handsomely stated, no one can question; but it is due to truth that I shall say that, in my judgment, our Government let itself down by consenting to argue such a question. The reply the proposition merited might have been given with far more force and justice in ten sentences. It might have been said in answer, that if Great Britain and France chose to suggest to the United States that neither of the three Governments should acquire additional territory in any part of the world, as such a proposition would have the appearance of mutuality and fairness, the Government of the United States would take it into consideration; but that the proposition actually submitted did not merit to be entertained at all. At that very time, sir, Great Britain was actively extending her dominions in Asia and elsewhere, and France was pressing her conquests in Africa; and in the face of these things they had the MODESTY to propose that the United States should agree not to acquire a territory on her borders, eminently desirable to her, and lying in the very direction in which alone she could hope for extension. Was there ever a more impudent proposition? and did not our Government lower itself by condescending to argue it?

But having failed to induce the United States to agree never to acquire the island, Great Britain determined to ruin it, so that whenever it did fall into our hands, it should at least prove worthless. In the conduct of wars in barbaric times, when a province could no longer be held against an invader, it was not uncommon for those who were compelled to abandon it to burn its cities, destroy its bridges and aqueducts, poison its wells, and waste its fields, so that the conqueror might find its possession an incumbrance rather than an advantage. Such is the policy which Great Britain has deliberately adopted with reference to Cuba and the West India Islands. Seeing that, in the natural course of things, they will probably become ours, she has resolved that, if not entirely ruined, (for to do this is beyond her power,) they shall at least be so damaged as greatly to reduce their value to us.

Early in the present session, a gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Etheridge] introduced a resolution denouncing in strong terms any suggestion in favor of reopening the African slave trade. It was followed by the resolution of my friend from South Carolina, [Mr. Orr,] likewise decidedly adverse to such restoration, which the House with great unanimity adopted.

Well, sir, about that very time the newspapers were bringing to our notice such paragraphs as these. I read from the *Daily Globe* which was laid on our desks on the morning of the 16th of December last:

“The New York Journal of Commerce has a letter from Havana, stating that the African slave trade is flourishing there without check, and that there are large and increasing importations of Chinese, a Spanish ship having just arrived with three hundred and twenty, and seven hundred and sixty-five having been sold during the previous week, at from \$170 to \$190 per head.”

In the *Union* of January 1, I find the following paragraph :

“THE COOLY TRADE.—Extract of a letter from Havana, dated the 25th ultimo : ‘Another cargo of three hundred and nineteen Asiatics has arrived here, decimated from the *quantity* embarked at Amoy during a voyage of two hundred and twenty-six days. They arrived on the 22d by a Holland ship, Bellona, Scriver, consigned to Torreis, Puentes & Co. They have been already assigned to purchasers by the speculators in this trade at \$170, and some of them resold at \$190 each.’”

These specimens are sufficient ; and from them it seems that in sight of our own coast, publicly and in open market, white men are regularly sold into slavery, without one word of complaint from the sensitive member from Tennessee [Mr. Etheridge] and his numerous backers on this floor.

Look for a moment at the difference between the two cases. The African slave trade was abolished by this Government fifty years ago, and since then all the civilized countries of the world have pronounced and legislated against it in the most decided form that human enactments can assume. Besides this, Great Britain and the United States keep up large fleets on the coast of Africa to prevent individuals from engaging in it. Nor has any member of Congress ever proposed here by bill, resolution, or speech, as I know or believe, to re-establish it ; nor has any one State or State Legislature recommended it ; and yet the bare suggestion by one individual that it ought to be reopened, gave such a shock to the sensibilities of the gentleman from Tennessee, that his feelings could only find vent in the most exaggerated and heart-rending figures of speech. He seemed to be thrown into convulsions by the idea, as a hydrophobia patient is by the sight of water ; and yet he represents a body of *white* men on this floor, and looks with supine indifference on the sale, in open daylight, of large numbers of *white* men occurring on our very borders. Nor is there any law existing to prevent this really great mischief. But while he is thus indifferent to the existence of the slave trade in *white men*—men of the same color with his constituents, the idea that *negroes* should be sold so operated on him and many others on this side of the House, that they were thrown into as great convulsions and contortions as a frog's leg would be by a powerful galvanic battery.

I have been waiting, sir, for an opportunity to bring up these gentlemen on this question ; and I intend, if it is afforded me, to compel them, if possible, to vote directly on a proposition condemning the slave trade in white men. I wish the whole country to see who they are, if any such there be. who, while affecting to be so horrified at the thought of the selling of negroes, view with supreme indifference the enslaving of *white men*. In affirming, as I do, that the white man is eminently fitted to enjoy freedom rather than the negro, I shall at least have on my side, and in support of my opinion, the whole history and experience of man, the manifestations of nature herself, and the decrees of God Almighty. I desire especially to obtain a declaration of the opinion of this body against the system practiced by Great Britain and Spain. This House of Representatives, in view of the numbers, intelligence, and capacity

of those whom it represents, is undoubtedly the first such body that has existed on the globe, either in ancient or modern times; and its judgment, deliberately pronounced, cannot fail to produce an impression on the civilized world.

But to show how this system of transporting and selling into slavery these Coolies is managed by Great Britain and Spain, I will, in the first place, ask the attention of the House to the decrees of the Spanish Government. They were transmitted to the British Government by Lord Howden, its Minister at Madrid, and are contained in a volume of the State Papers. They bear date, as signed by the Queen, March 22, 1854. Their examination shows that the Coolies are, in fact, no better than slaves. Even the provisions made especially for their benefit show this; and I read a few as specimens:

By the twentieth article, "The colonists may contract marriage with the consent of their masters."

By the thirty-fourth article, "Forbidden to leave the estate without written permission of master," &c.

The thirty-eighth article provides, "That they shall not be compelled to work more than twelve hours on the average."

By the thirty-ninth article, "They shall not be obliged to work more than fifteen hours in one day, and shall always have at least six consecutive hours of rest by night or by day."

Look at these provisions, and tell me if the slaves are in any State of this Union worked on an average, throughout the year, twelve hours per day, or if they are obliged, at any season, to labor for as much as fifteen hours. As to giving them six consecutive hours for rest, why, most field negroes in the South would sleep twice that period of time if they did not get hungry while so doing.

Article sixty-one declares for what offenses they shall be punished, as follows:

"1. Insubordination to the master, to the superintendents, or any other delegate of the master.

"2. Refusal to work, or want of punctuality in any particular piece of work.

"3. Injuries which do not oblige the party injured to suspend work.

"4. Desertion.

"5. Drunkenness.

"6. Infraction of the rules of discipline established by the master.

"7. Offences against good manners not constituting crimes, &c.

"8. Any other act done with malice, and from which injury or damage accrues to a third person, &c.

"ART. 64. When the punishments pointed out in article fifty-six are not sufficient to prevent the colonist from repeating the same, or committing other offenses, the master shall apply to the protector, who, if the act constitutes an offense according to the laws, shall decide that the guilty colonist shall be punished by them; and if not, by additional disciplinary punishment."

By these decrees it is provided that the inhabitants of China and Yucatan may be imported. The Chinese are white people, and the Yucatanese are Indians; and it might be supposed that these two races ought to be sufficient for the Island of Cuba.

I find, however, in the newspapers, another proposition made to the Spanish Government, though I am not prepared to say that it has actually been adopted. If not already sanctioned, I suppose it will be, as it is strictly in accordance with the policy heretofore established :

"1. Her Catholic Majesty shall concede to the contractor (Senor Meana) the usufruct of the Islands of Fernando Po, Annobon and Coriseo, with their wild and cleared lands, for the term of twenty years from the date of the concession, giving him also an assistance of \$20,000 yearly."

* * * * *

"11. He shall be authorized to transport to the Island of Cuba, to the exclusion of all others, under contract for the term of eight years, such inhabitants of the said islands as voluntarily, and without any kind of coercion, may agree to come to it, under the following condition :

"The grantee shall not receive in repayment of all cost, from the masters to whom the persons contracted shall be assigned, and to whom, with this view, their contracts shall be transferred, a greater sum than \$204 for such as are between eighteen and forty-five years of age, and \$136 for such as are between eight and eighteen."

The Island of Fernando Po, I need hardly remind the House, is situated in the Gulf of Guinea, in sight of the main land, and in fact within some thirty miles of Old Calabar, a principal station for the African slave trade. Of course, the people taken from this region will be *Guinea negroes*. But it is provided that none shall be taken away but those who agree to go. Who will they be, sir? Why, it is well known that annually large numbers of slaves are brought from the interior to the coast to be sold, and when purchasers are not found they are slaughtered in large gangs, because their masters are afraid to turn them loose; I mean the males. The females are bought usually by the Kroomen along the shore; and, as I have been informed by our navy officers stationed on that coast, they command sixteen dollars apiece, while the male negroes may be worth only six. Of course these negroes, when they find that it is a choice between death and transportation, will agree to take the latter, and will thus be enrolled.

The provision limiting the price for the first class to \$204, is pregnant with suggestions. It is not intended to cripple or diminish the trade, since it is clear that, even at these rates, enormous profits will be made by the shippers and sellers. It is, on the contrary, directly intended to increase the traffic to the most frightful extent, as the supply is inexhaustible. By thus putting them at a low rate, the purchasers will be the more tempted. The planters of Cuba, seeing that their island is to be ruined anyhow, will be forced to conclude that it is their true interest to get as many of these creatures as possible, and work them even to death in eight years. Every one knows that he who hires a horse for a short period is apt to take less care of him and work him harder than the owner would do. Then it may be assumed that not many will survive this period. But should they even do so, and be then in good faith liberated, how many of them will, in fact, ever reach Africa again? Who that knows the Guinea negro expects them to return by force of this *Spanish contract*? No, sir, they will remain

there; and these negroes, by their mixture with the Chinese Coolies, the Yucatenese Indians, and the present black and mongrel population of Cuba, will fill the island with a body of savages, so that such of the planters as have the means of emigrating will be forced to do so, and thus this beautiful gem of the Antilles will soon be in a worse condition than it was when Columbus crossed the Atlantic.

The acts of the British Government justify us in assuming that, as she sees that the West India Islands are likely to be ours, she has deliberately resolved to ruin them as far as it in her power lies. This is, however, all professed to be done in the name of humanity! How long is it, sir, since Great Britain, in one year, permitted more than two millions of her Irish subjects to starve to death? Why, the newspapers state—whether truly or not I cannot tell—that more than twenty-one thousand of them perished in this way during the past year. These things are permitted to occur without any real or sincere effort to prevent them. In fact, what she has spent on her African fleet would have been more than sufficient, if properly directed, to have saved the lives of every one of those white people. Then look to the frightfully cruel system that is carried on by her in India. There, a population more than five times as great as that of the whole United States is subjected to the most grinding oppression. The land is owned in places by the Government, and the people are compelled to work it, and pay one half, and even more in some provinces, as rent. To collect this exorbitant amount, torture is habitually applied to the miserable laborers. There is no doubt about this matter. The British Parliament was forced, by public opinion at home, to appoint a commission to go to India and take testimony. Their report, officially made, shows that, to force the laborers to perform more than human nature is capable of, there are constantly and systematically applied tortures which surpass in variety and cruelty those of the famous Spanish Inquisition, or even such as the imagination of antiquity was able to invent for application in the infernal regions. The mind absolutely shrinks back from the atrocities of these details. A large percentage of the immense population of the country has already perished most miserably by these tortures, and the famines consequent on such exactions. And yet, sir, though these matters have thus been made public in England, and also in this country, and during the last year, by myself and others, commented on, yet they have been completely ignored by that portion of our press and those orators that profess to have in their especial charge all matters pertaining to freedom and humanity. Is it not a strange spectacle, sir? But so absorbed are the Abolitionists in their idolatry of everything English, that if one could speak to them in a voice louder than seven thunders, they would not hear these things. Yes, sir, if the idea was sharpened to the keenest point possible, and then driven by the force of an engine of ten thousand horse power, it would not be able to make a lodgment in their brains. No, sir, the genuine Abolitionists would look you right in the face, with the stolid, stupid insensibility of a stone image. Mr. Chairman, suppose a man were to tell you that he was shocked by your cruelty to your slaves, or servants; and at the same time you knew that, with ample means in his hands, he allowed his own children to starve

to death from time to time, and that he also had seized upon other persons, and because they did not perform tasks that exceeded the powers of human nature, was torturing them to death by every sort of devilish device that malice and cruelty could suggest, would you believe in that man's humanity? Then, sir, I do not believe in this kind of British humanity.

The beautiful islands that stud our American Mediterranean are in this way likely to be made desolate, and to become the abode of savages. Should they fall into our hands in the march of events, they will present serious obstacles in the way of turning them to a proper account. How long did it take the Pilgrims to kill, or otherwise get clear of the Pequods and other Indians in New England? What obstacles did not the savages present to the settlement of the Southern States? If Great Britain should merely retard the occupation of these islands for twenty-five or fifty years, this would be a great deal gained to her, as she thinks, in the race between the two countries. If all these islands are placed in the condition that St. Domingo now is, how are they to be made to answer the purpose for which Providence seems to have intended them? There is a precedent in English history which is brought to mind. In the year 1066, one William, Duke of Normandy, surnamed the Conqueror, crossed the British channel with a body of his followers. He beat down the English, killed their monarch, and seized upon the island. He then divided its territory and inhabitants among his followers. I cannot say, Mr. Chairman, that I approve of this precedent, because the fair-haired, white-skinned Saxons then enslaved have since shown that they are eminently worthy of the freedom that they have by their intellect and courage recovered.

But would the same remark apply to the negro race anywhere? Suppose that Lopez, Walker, or some other *Norman* or *South-man* fillibuster, should make a descent on St. Domingo, confiscate the island, and divide its territory and people (such at least, as did not choose to emigrate from it) among his followers, the civilized world would be a gainer, and its present population probably not losers by the operation. I rather think with Carlyle, the English writer, that Cuffee, living lazily on squashes, has no right to expect that he is forever to incumber these fine islands; but that somebody or other will, one of these days, set him to work, and make him produce sugar, coffee, and the like things, which Providence seems to have intended these islands to yield for the benefit of mankind. At least, Cuffee's title to obstruct a proper use of these West Indies is not better than was that of the original savages and wolves to hold, against our present system of civilization, these banks of the Potomac, on which our magnificent Capitol now stands.

Great Britain has, too, been sending her Jamaica free negroes into Central America to Africanize it likewise. Such being her policy, viz: to prevent, if possible, our acquisition of territory—and if this attempt on her part should fail, at least to render the territory of as little value as possible—what has our government been doing to counteract her movements? I am sorry to be obliged to say, little or nothing. The present administration, in advance of its predecessors, has, it is true, directed its attention to the subject, and made some remonstrances against these movements. In a dispatch of July 2, 1853,

Mr. Marcy, the Secretary of State, to Mr. Buchanan, our Minister at London, says:

"We do not complain that Great Britain enforces her treaty stipulations in regard to the *emancipados* in Cuba; but if it should prove to be true that she is using her influence in furtherance of a design to fill that island with emigrants from Africa, in order that when the Spanish rule over it shall cease it may become an African colony given over to barbarism, she ought to be conscious that she is concurring in an act which, in its consequences, must be injurious to the United States."

How does Mr. Buchanan reply? On the 18th of October, 1854, he says:

"Under such circumstances, we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us. We forbear to enter into the question, whether the present condition of the island would justify such a measure? We should, however, be recreant to our duty, be unworthy our gallant forefathers, and commit base treason against our posterity, should we permit Cuba to be Africanized, and become a second St. Domingo, with all its attendant horrors to the white race, and suffer the flames to extend to our own neighboring shores, seriously to endanger, or actually to consume the fair fabric of our Union."

This language, sir, of the President elect has the ring of the true metal. It is genuine bullion, and not tinsel merely put on to deceive the public. Under him we are entitled to expect that the country will take the proper stand to resist the British policy which I have been condemning. We need a bolder foreign policy, sir.

But we shall, perhaps, be told that there is danger of a war with England if we do not acquiesce in her views. Sir, we have no treaty with Great Britain to prevent her taking possession of Mexico, and yet she does not seize it. We expressly refused the convention as to Cuba, and though she muttered some threats, hitherto she has not attempted to take it. She does not do so, because it is not, in her opinion, her interest under the existing circumstances. Then why should Central America be in more danger of seizure from her? Will not the same stand on our part that is sufficient to protect Cuba likewise prevent her taking possession of Central America? I do not suppose for a moment that she would hesitate to go to war with us to maintain her honor, or to protect any really essential interest. But if we are involved in a rupture with her, it will be because of some sudden and unforeseen casualty which leaves her no alternative. As we are not likely to give her any just occasion, so she will not deliberately go to war with us. She is too good a calculator for that. In the first place, look at the commerce between the two countries. During the last fiscal year we purchased from her goods, &c., to the value of one hundred and fifty-four millions of dollars, and sold her in return two hundred and four millions. There is a trade between the two countries of three hundred and fifty-eight millions, which must be sacrificed during a war. She also gets from us the cotton that supplies her

manufacturing establishments. If she were compelled to procure it through the shipping of neutral nations, its cost would be increased materially, and at the same time the marine of these other parties would be built up hereafter to rival her own perhaps. In the third place, a war of a few years' duration would make us a great manufacturing people, so that on the return of peace we should be in a condition to do without her goods, and, in fact, might have become a formidable competitor to her in the markets of the world.

There is, however, still a consideration of greater weight than all these put together. We have hostages on this continent to hold her to terms of peace. She could not, at this time, hope to defend Canada against a well-directed attack by us. If she had no territory on this continent, she would be vastly stronger as against us, and much more likely to go to war than she now is. It may be said, however, that if this be so, why should she not make up her mind to lose Canada and her other possessions? But she could not afford to lose them in war without loss of great *prestige*, and the probable loss of Australia, India, and other colonies. She would then be reduced to the condition of Carthage after the second Punic war. She might still be wealthy, polished, and capable of making a formidable resistance at home; but she would no longer be dreaded abroad. The power of Great Britain consists mainly in her commerce, her naval supremacy, her wealth, her *prestige*, and her diplomacy. The loss of her colonies would materially impair all these sources of her great power. Look to her recent history, and it will be obvious that her strength is not mainly owing to the military force she can bring into the field. For the last century she has not been able to fight with her own means any of the great Powers on the continent of Europe. In fact, I do not remember that during this time she has ever landed her troops on a hostile territory, but only on the dominion of her allies. She plumes herself on beating Napoleon at Waterloo; but it was after his strength had been exhausted in the campaigns of Italy, Egypt, and Spain, and on the Rhine and the Danube. It was after he had lost half a million of his best men under the snows of Russia, and the remnant of his armies had been trampled under foot by the forces of all Europe in the campaigns of 1813 and 1814; it was then that his exhausted energies yielded to Wellington, assailed as he was at the same time by a fresh Prussian army in his flank and rear.

So well does England know her own strength that she used formerly to fight France with the help of Russia, and latterly Russia with the aid of France. When, therefore, in her continental difficulties, she cannot obtain a powerful ally, she waives the occasion, and consults her interest. I use the word *interest* in its largest sense, for she knows that the preservation of her honor is of the highest interest to her. She is as sagacious in avoiding a collision with a powerful enemy, as she is haughty and domineering towards a weak one. She knows, too, how much may be accomplished by constant pressure upon us, and by constant complaint of us. She strenuously opposed the annexation of Texas, though with no more justification or excuse on her

part than we should have had to complain of the union between England and Scotland.

Notwithstanding the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, she in violation of its whole spirit, as the records of our State department show, attempted in 1852 to force Guatemala to allow a Belgian colony to settle in her territory.

When there was a proposition made for the acquisition of the Sandwich Islands, she, with no claim over them, strenuously resisted it.

When we were attempting to procure a site for a coal depot in St. Domingo, she even made active and successful opposition.

Even at the time we were negotiating a treaty in relation to the guano trade with Ecuador, she succeeded in getting up such opposition as defeated the project. Why, when Commodore Perry was looking at some little uninhabited islands in the Pacific, he was called to account to know what his intentions were. In fact, in all matters she seems to keep up a sort of surveillance over us. As a general proposition, I think it may be asserted that Great Britain makes it a point to assert dominion over all territory on the globe which is not in possession of somebody capable of defending it. She in an especial manner takes it upon herself to oversee us, and prevent our growing too fast. But while she has been acting thus, our conduct to her has, except when she has directly thrown herself in contact with our interests, been forbearing in the extreme. Our government makes no objection to her constant acquisitions in various quarters of the world. Without any complaint here, she may go and take possession of all Asia, if Russia does not prevent her. She may extend her dominions from the Cape of Good Hope over all Africa, if France permits. She already holds Australia, the fifth great section of the world. Nor are we disposed to interfere with her immense possessions in the northern parts of this continent. But as to that remaining parcel of territory which lies between us and the Isthmus of Panama, she ought to see that the United States has claims to its control. If she persists in her present course, then let the collision come, with all its consequences. Every one must see that our former subserviency has neither won her respect, nor obtained her forbearance.

In the expression of these opinions, sir, I am actuated by no feeling of hostility to Great Britain. My course here, as a member, might be referred to, to show this. I have advocated the greatest freedom of trade between the two countries, believing that both would be benefitted thereby. The Canadian reciprocity act was much more beneficial to her than to us, it in fact giving to her possessions most of the advantages of being in our Union, without the burdens it imposes. This measure was grossly partial and unjust to other sections in its principles; and yet, after opposing it through one Congress, because it was beneficial to certain portions of our people, and because it was a step in the direction of free trade, I gave it my support when it became a law. I might point to the matter of the late ship *Resolute*, and some other things, to prove that I entertain no prejudice against her.

The courage, manliness, and other high qualities of the English people, are eminently worthy of admiration. While taking exception

to the course of their government in some respects, I must commend one of its traits to our own for imitation. It protects its subjects in all parts of the world. Our government does often the reverse with regard to its citizens. Hence, when in foreign countries, I understand that Americans, where it is practicable to do so, represent themselves as being Englishmen, and thus secure respect and protection. Many instances might be referred to, to show this. I read, as a sample, an extract from a letter written by an American lady in Nicaragua :

“The American Minister was called home at the worst time, for this war is not against General Walker alone, but on all Americans. Poor Mr. Callaghan was whipped to death when he fell into the hands of the enemy, although he was no officer; and every American they can catch is destined to the same fate. English people are not treated so, for England will not put up with it; but our Government is the meanest in the world in that way.”

This probably does some injustice to our government. Our Secretary of State has, perhaps, done all in his power with our limited navy. You told me, Mr. Chairman, that when you represented our country as Commissioner to China, American interests suffered seriously for the want of a few ships. The conduct of Captain Ingraham in a noted instance is the exception, and it shines like a bright light on a dark ground. As to how the British carry it, their late attack on Canton shows. There they assailed and captured a city of more than a million of inhabitants, with far less provocation than we had in the matter of Greytown. As to the Greytown business, the chief, if not the only objection I see, arises from the feebleness of those assailed. It did look a little like shooting rats, instead of letting terriers attend to them. Probably it was unavoidable, however. So many greater wrongs, if this was a wrong, occur in British history, that one is amused by seeing their affected horrors at the sight of our barbarity.

I should not be surprised if she were to hold on to Canton, and ultimately take possession of China. She will then civilize it as she formerly did Ireland, and is just now civilizing India. She will manage to get some wealth for her officials, and some products for her commerce, out of the four or five hundred millions of people there. As the population is crowded now to the extent of producing frequent famines, if half of them die under the pressure of her foot, why, those left will have more room, and humanity will be promoted thereby, and civilization and Christianity propagated.

I hold, then, Mr. Chairman, that while a decided, firm policy on our part to maintain what we have a right to claim, will not endanger our peaceful relations, yet it is our duty to make the stand in any event. Let Great Britain accord to us what we concede to her—let her recognize our equality with her, and there will be a permanent, stable friendship between the two countries that must prove highly advantageous to both. The acquisition, by the United States, at some future day, of the countries of which I have been speaking, by increasing vastly the supply of tropical productions for the use of the world, must

prove highly advantageous to all civilized nations. In a pecuniary and commercial point of view, Great Britain would receive benefits little, if any, short of ours. The two countries possess more than two-thirds of the shipping of the world, and this preponderance is likely to be increased rather than diminished. The sixty millions who now speak the Anglo-Saxon tongue, if united, by reason of their intelligence, energy, wealth, maritime ascendancy, and territorial possessions, may guide the destinies of civilization. The fault will be England's if we have a collision. This is more likely to be prevented by firmness and frankness on our part, than by an opposite policy.

If I have not spoken, sir, of the interference with our domestic affairs by a portion of her subjects and press, it is not because I regard that as affording less grounds of complaint than the points already referred to. This branch of the discussion would involve us to some extent in the consideration of those sectional issues with which I think the country is already wearied. I have rather sought, therefore, to present these considerations in such a manner as to invite the examination of all who have true American minds, and are willing to look at them as national questions should be examined.

[After Mr. Buchanan's accession to the Presidency, instead of a vigorous American policy, with reference to questions about which we had had controversies with Great Britain, his course was just the reverse. In fact, he seemed to have been completely won over to England by the courtesy of the Ouseley Mission. His admiration for the British government became boundless, and he not only declined himself to do or say anything that might be disagreeable to it, but he acted as though he thought it might be offended with him, if he did not suppress all demonstrations in Congress against its wishes.

After many rather disagreeable conversations with him on that subject, I decided, as Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs in the House, that I would entirely disregard his wishes. In spite of his efforts, which were unceasing, with those members of the committee that he could control, a majority authorized a report in favor of the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. A majority of the House, too, sustained the resolution, on a vote of the ayes and nays, notwithstanding the persistent opposition of the President's especial friends. On the day following this vote I ceased to be a member of the House, and final action was not had on the resolution.

In support of the general line of policy which I thought the government ought to adopt the following speech was made:]

SPEECH

AGAINST THE CLAYTON - BULWER TREATY, AND IN FAVOR
OF AMERICAN ASCENDENCY IN THE GULF OF MEXICO
AND CENTRAL AMERICA, DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 5, 1858.

MR. CLINGMAN said:

MR. SPEAKER: With the indulgence of the House I will make some explanation of the report made from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the arrest of General Walker by Commodore Paulding. It will be remembered, at an early day of this session I offered some resolutions, in the following words:

Resolved, That the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, designated as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, being, under the interpretation placed on it by Great Britain, an entire surrender of the rights of this country, and upon the American construction, an entangling alliance without mutuality either in its benefits or restrictions, and having hitherto been productive only of misunderstandings and controversies between the two governments, ought therefore to be abrogated.

Resolved, That since the acquisition and settlement of our territory on the Pacific, certain portions of Central America stand to us in a relation similar to that which Louisiana, prior to its acquisition, bore to our territory in the Mississippi valley, and therefore ought not to be subject to the control of any foreign Power that might interfere materially with our interests.

Resolved, That inasmuch as the government of the United States has heretofore taken steps to suppress the African slave trade, and is at present subjecting itself to

a considerable annual expense to keep up a squadron on the coast of Africa to prevent the same, we feel it to be our duty to protest against the trade in white men, commonly called the Coolie trade, not only on principles of humanity with reference to the subjects of that traffic, but also because it is eminently injurious in its ultimate effects to the countries to which they are transported.

They indicate the line of policy upon which I expect to speak to-day; but before doing so I desire to offer a few words on the subject of this Paulding report.

It takes the ground that he, Commodore Paulding, had no authority to arrest General Walker in Nicaragua. It has been said that pirates may be followed into any jurisdiction, and there has been an attempt to liken this case to that. On that point, I can refer to a very high authority. Mr. Webster, in his letter to Mr. Fox, says:

“Her Majesty’s government are pleased, also, to speak of those American citizens who took part with persons in Canada engaged in an insurrection against the British government, as ‘American pirates.’ The undersigned does not admit the propriety or justice of this designation. If citizens of the United States fitted out, or were engaged in fitting out, a military expedition from the United States, intended to act against the British government in Canada, they were clearly violating the laws of their own country, and exposing themselves to the just consequences which might be inflicted on them if taken within the British dominions. But, notwithstanding this, they were certainly not pirates, nor does the undersigned think that it can advance the purpose of fair and friendly discussion, or hasten the accommodation of national difficulties, so to denominate them. Their offence, whatever it was, had no analogy to cases of piracy. Supposing all that is alleged against them to be true, they were taking a part in what they regarded as a civil war, and they were taking a part on the side of the rebels. Surely England herself has not regarded persons thus engaged as deserving the appellation which her Majesty’s government bestows on these citizens of the United States.

“It is quite notorious that, for the greater part of the last two centuries, subjects of the British Crown have been permitted to engage in foreign wars, both national and civil, and in the latter in every stage of their progress; and yet it has not been imagined that England has at any time allowed her subjects to turn pirates. Indeed, in our own times, not only have individual subjects of that Crown gone abroad to engage in civil wars, but we have seen whole regiments openly recruited, embodied armed, and disciplined in England, with the avowed purpose of aiding a rebellion against a nation with which England was at peace.”

I will remind the House, in addition to that strong authority, that when General Felix Houston proposed to raise an expedition to help the Greeks in their revolution, John Quincy Adams, then President of the United States, Henry Clay, then Secretary of State, Daniel Webster, Forsyth and Lafayette gave him strong letters of recommendation. Lafayette himself was an illustrious example of that kind of piracy. In the debate which took place in the House some time ago, it was urged that Paulding had a right to follow Walker as a criminal into the jurisdiction of Nicaragua, and arrest him. This is contrary

to the law of nations; and if gentlemen will take the trouble to look into the extradition treaties which have been entered into with Great Britain, with Switzerland, and with other countries, they will find that those countries have recognized no such right as this; nor has the right, in any case, been conceded, but only the right to make a demand on the executives. The Nicaraguan Minister could not have given any such authority. It is an authority which can be granted only by the treaty-making power. Mr. Dallas could not authorize any English captain to come into the United States for such a purpose; that could only be done by the President and the Senate, as the treaty-making power.

But it is argued, in the third place, that Paulding went there for the benefit of Nicaragua. Well, sir, upon that point I have to say that an officer in charge of the United States forces can only use those forces in the service of the United States. That proposition, I think, is indisputable. What the last House of Representatives thought on that subject, I beg leave to show, by presenting the vote upon a resolution of my own.

I will say to the House, in explanation of the circumstances under which I offered that resolution, that immediately after the Panama outbreak and the slaughter of our people occurred, I went to see the late Secretary of State, Mr. Marcy, and advised at once that a body of troops should be sent down to protect the Panama railroad. I called Mr. Marcy's attention to the fact that the United States had guaranteed the safety of the line by a treaty which was the supreme law of the land. He admitted such was the treaty, but said that the Executive could not use the United States forces within a foreign jurisdiction without the authority of Congress. I reminded him of what had been done at Greytown, and he intimated that they had probably exceeded the law at Greytown; "but," said he, "we will do anything we can do from the guns of our ships, but we cannot land troops there."

I say, Mr. Speaker—because this has been a subject of some discussion lately, and I am a very frank man in politics—that I did press upon the Secretary of State the importance of sending troops there, taking possession of that line, and holding that isthmus as a satisfaction, but agreeing to pay to New Granada a sum of perhaps two or three millions to boot, for a cession to us. That was my line of policy. I desire to hold that isthmus. I also remember very well, that, in the course of that conversation—for I was perhaps a little ultra and pressing in my remarks—in reply to a question of the Secretary of State, as to what we all thought up here in Congress about his foreign policy, I did say to him that, in my judgment, his foreign policy had been irritating and weak; that they had quarreled with everybody, and maintained nothing.

But, sir, it is sufficient for my purpose to say that the Secretary of State thought that there was no authority, and he referred me to the President. I had a conversation with President Pierce on the subject, and he took the same view of it: that without authority from Congress, the Executive could not use the troops of the United States in any for-

eign jurisdiction. I therefore presented in the House the following resolution :

Be it resolved, &c., That for the better protection of the persons and property of American citizens, under the law of nations, and as secured by existing treaty stipulations with reference to the thoroughfares or lines of travel between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to employ any part of the land or naval forces of the country, and to call for and use any number of volunteers that may be necessary to provide for the safety of passengers and others of our citizens in those localities, and to insure the observance of such rights as the government and citizens of the United States are entitled to enjoy on said transits.

“Mr. Jones, of Tennessee. It is a proposition authorizing the President to take possession of Central America. [Laughter.] I do not want it here at this time.”

Mr. Campbell, of Ohio, said that when the resolution came in he should introduce a proposition for the annexation of the British Provinces. After a little discussion the matter went over until the next Monday, and the House adjourned. On the following Monday the vote upon the suspension of the rules was—yeas 53, nays 74. A large majority of Congress were unwilling to allow me to introduce a resolution of that sort authorizing the President of the United States to use the troops to protect the lives of American citizens on that line, because in a foreign jurisdiction? Why? Because they feared the President might take possession of Central America, or annex it, or involve us in war. Of course, if the President is not to be trusted, I suppose gentlemen will not trust his subordinates, either officers in the army or navy, to do the same thing. But the question is, whether Paulding had a right to do what he did in the absence of any act of Congress. I think everybody will agree, upon a moment's reflection, that this is a proposition which is not debatable; and hence, in this report, I maintain that he had no authority, under the laws of nations, or under the Constitution and laws of the United States for that act.

But, Mr. Speaker, suppose the resolution which I offered in the last Congress, and which I have just read, had been adopted and carried out, what might have been the effect? The President might have occupied the Isthmus of Panama, a narrow neck of territory two or three hundred miles in extent, which would have been of vast advantage to us, it being that narrow isthmus over which the world may find the best connection between the Atlantic and Pacific. Of course, we should have done as we did in the case of California; we should have allowed some balance to New Granada, and paid them whatever amount they were willing to take. Gentlemen may smile; but I see it stated in the papers that the Attorney General of New Granada, who controls that country, is actually asking that it shall all be annexed to the United States for nothing.

But, sir, another purpose which I had very much at heart, was to open this Nicaragua line—Walker, you will recollect, was then in

power, and remained in power about a year. Now, if we had opened that line, the effect would have been that men and supplies could have reached William Walker, and I have no doubt that he would have sustained himself in that country. He was overthrown, it will be remembered, by the combined efforts of the Central American States, of Commodore Vanderbilt, and of the British influence against him, and by all the aid the Secretary of State could give in cutting off supplies; and ultimately the capture of his ships and men by Davis, one of our naval officers.

I say, therefore, that it is very obvious to my mind that if my resolution had been adopted and carried out, and communication had thus been opened with him, he would have been sustained, and I have no doubt he would have established a better system than they now have there.

Even now, it would be of vast advantage to this country to have that line opened. It has been closed for more than two years, and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKibbin) tells me that the State of California loses at least a million and a half of dollars a year by reason of the stoppage of that line. They charge thirty-three per cent. higher to go by the Panama route than they would by this line. It has been stated in newspapers, whether correctly or not I do not know, that the Panama Company is paying \$40,000 a month, or \$480,000 a year to keep the Nicaragua line closed. Well, if they are getting \$1,500,000 by it, they can afford to pay \$480,000, and make a very handsome profit out of it, by reason of the monopoly they thus enjoy.

I may say, in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that I see that a proclamation was issued in New York, on the twenty-second April last, by Mr. Yrissurri, and a previous dispatch, of December thirtieth, eighteen hundred and fifty-seven, in which he announces that if any citizen of the United States goes to Nicaragua or attempts to pass through it to California, as we have a right to do under the original treaty, he he will be treated as an enemy, and stopped if he does not go by a certain line, to-wit: the Atlantic and Pacific Ship Canal Company. I doubt, sir, if there is anything in our treaty regulations to justify that. I hold that it is the right of every American citizen, we being at peace with Nicaragua, to go to that country in any ship he thinks proper to take. But if this be true, I submit to gentlemen upon all sides whether a monopoly like this is to be tolerated. True, the company is a New York one, but do the people of New York themselves wish to be at their mercy? Suppose the British government were to provide that nobody should go to Great Britain unless he went there in the Cunard line of steamers, so as to give them a monopoly and enable them to charge enormously high rates, would not every New Yorker, and much more the people of Boston, Philadelphia and other cities complain of such a regulation?

I see that in another publication, lately made, it is said that any man who goes to the country without a permit from the minister, or from his consul in New York, will be treated as an enemy. I hold, sir, that we have a right to exercise an influence upon that country to secure the right of way to our Pacific possessions; and I trust that the

treaty-making power of the United States will not allow any regulation to be made by which we are to lose that right. A gentleman (Mr. Bingham) on my right asks me if there is any danger losing it. Why, that company claims to have the sole right to carry passengers there. Suppose they do not carry any, as they have not carried them for two years or more. The way is blocked up; and I am told, as I have already said, that they are getting \$40,000 a month to keep it stopped for the benefit of the Panama Company. That is the allegation. But suppose it is not true. I ask the gentleman from Ohio if he, as an American citizen, is willing to deprive the people of this country of the right to go to California, unless they go in a particular line of ships? Why, there are not more than five hundred thousand people in that country—mostly Indians and negroes. And are we to allow them to block up our way to our Pacific possessions, unless we choose to submit to an enormous monopoly of that sort?

I conclude what I have to say about Commodore Paulding by simply declaring that the effects of that act of his have been very unfortunate to us. It has been calculated to aid British interests and not American interests in that quarter, and has been properly appreciated in England, and at Havana. All the letters I see from Central America say that, instead of getting credit among the people by that act, we are in, perhaps, worse reputation there than we were previously, because they supposed we were compelled, by Great Britain to arrest Walker.

This brings me to the consideration of the relations that exist between Great Britain and ourselves in regard to Central America, as affected by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a struggle going on between the United States and Great Britain for some years, in regard to this Central American country. It commenced with the acquisition of California, and the gold discoveries there. Before that time Great Britain had been exerting her influence without interruption from us; but as soon as she saw that the United States, by the passing of her citizens to California, would have advantages in, and would probably acquire that country, she made a proposition to us through Sir Henry Bulwer, which our administration, exhibiting, as I hold, great imbecility, adopted. I think we were circumvented in it; and it is that proposition which I now desire this House to consider, and which—if gentlemen will examine it—I believe every one on this floor will in his conscience pronounce to have been a great blunder.

The ostensible object of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was to provide for opening the route to California; but unfortunately that part of it has not been executed. That would have been advantageous. Its great feature, so objectionable, is the first article, which provides that neither Great Britain nor the United States shall ever occupy, colonize, fortify, or assume or exercise, any jurisdiction over Central America, or any portion of it, either directly or indirectly, by any treaty with any Power, or by reason of any protectorate, &c. It is an agreement between both governments by which neither is ever to take possession of that country, to the end of all time. It has been called a Wil-

mot proviso, but it is vastly more objectionable than the old Wilmot proviso.

We of the South have thought that a denial of the right to expand was unjust. It was a denial by congressional legislation, but a denial which our government, where we were represented, had imposed and might remove, and which they did remove in fact. But this Clayton-Bulwer treaty is a Wilmot proviso imposed by a foreign government against the growth not only of the South, but likewise of the North, and of the whole United States; declaring that in all time we shall not touch that country and occupy it. Great Britain herself is a little island, less in extent than several States in this Union; yet she has by conquest and fillibustering generally, acquired three times as much territory as the United States have. Great Britain, which like that fabled giant of old, has its hundred arms out in all directions, seizing territory everywhere, because she sees that the United States might have the advantage in Central America, says to us, "hands off!" and our government assents to it. Is it not, when stated, a monstrous proposition, that the limbs of this young, growing, and free Republic should be bound by any such treaty through all time? Why, Mr. Speaker, suppose we should say to Great Britain, we will agree that you and we will never take any portion of Asia; Great Britain would laugh at us; she would tell us that we had no possessions or interest there, and had no right to expect her to make any such agreement. Suppose we should say to her, "neither of us will touch any islands in the Red Sea, and especially the island of Perim, which you are now fortifying." Great Britain would say, "though we have no possessions within a thousand miles of that island, yet it lies directly between us and our possessions in the East, and therefore there is no mutuality in the proposition, and we will not make the treaty."

Being encouraged, however, by her success in this Clayton-Bulwer matter, she proposed a similar agreement in relation to Cuba; but the American people had been aroused, and understood the effect and folly of such a policy, and Mr. Everett and Mr. Fillmore declined the proposition. If it had been adopted, the next movement would have been in reference to Mexico, and our hands would have been completely tied by a great Power which is constantly acquiring territory in all parts of the world. Remember, sir, that this is the effect of our own American construction of this treaty. By our own interpretation of it our hands will be tied for all time. But we have not even the poor consolation that she is also bound. After the treaty was made, Great Britain said, "by its terms we are allowed to hold all we now possess, but we will not take any more; and, as you have got nothing there, you will take nothing." I need not argue against the absurdity of such a proposition. Suppose A and B are contending for a house, and A has possession of four of the five rooms in it; but there being one vacant room remaining, he proposes to B that neither of them shall occupy any part of that house, or exercise any control over it. It is agreed to; but after the contract has been executed, A says: "I am not to give up the four rooms I now hold, but I am not to take that fifth room, and you are to let it alone likewise, and to stay out of doors."

What would be said of such an arrangement? Now, to show that such is the case in the present instance, if gentlemen will look at this map, printed by order of the Senate two years ago, (here Mr. C. held up the map before the House,) they will see that this red line shows the British claim. They will find that it covers four-fifths of the eastern coast of Central America. Why, sir, that claim has been refuted by argument a hundred times. Mr. Buchanan himself argued it ably. If gentlemen will look at the speech of Senator Seward, made two years ago, they will find an able argument to show that Great Britain had no right whatever to hold one foot of that territory. Mr. Seward said that, sooner than submit to her pretension, we ought to have a war with her. But he makes an argument, founded on the evils of war, and recommends continued negotiation.

Mr. Wright, of Georgia. Does the gentleman from North Carolina concur in the views of Senator Seward?

Mr. Clingman. I will say to the gentleman that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Whether we shall go to war to resist this British assumption is a matter for another occasion; but I was showing how perfectly convinced Governor Seward was as to the injustice of her claim, to resist which he was willing to go to war. He recommends that we should negotiate further, a most lame and impotent conclusion; for we have been negotiating with her for the last eight years, and we have not yet succeeded in getting a settlement from her. If gentlemen would like to know with what rapidity negotiations with her progress, let them look back to her negotiations with Spain, and they will find that, for two hundred years, Spain has been trying to get her out of that country, and was not able to do it with all the treaties that could be made.

The truth is, that the British government has been strengthening itself in these possessions, and has held them for eight years, and she cannot, honorably, back out from the construction she has stood on so long. It was the proposition, however, of an administration which has gone out of power, and one which the present feeling of England and the present administration would, perhaps, not originally have indorsed. I think, therefore, with President Buchanan, that the true mode of meeting this issue is to abrogate the treaty, and to leave negotiation to arise upon it hereafter.

But I am met with this idea by gentlemen. The resolution reported by the committee is a declaration against both the British and American construction of the treaty, and recommends that the President take steps for its abrogation. But some gentlemen say that the President and Senate are the treaty-making power; and it is indelicate for this House to ever express an opinion on such a subject. There are some questions of such vast moment that the representatives of the people have the right to look into them. Suppose there was a proposition to annex all Mexico or Brazil to the United States; will it be contended that the representatives of the American people have not the right to express their opinion upon it, when every town meeting or popular gathering in the country has the right to do so? Remember that we are, in fact, the war-making power, and that treaties often

lead to war. We have to vote the money to carry them out, frequently, and therefore we must have the right to look into them. In England, whence we get our notions of parliamentary law, and of our rights to a great extent, though the King has the power to declare war and to make treaties without consulting either branch of Parliament, yet, in the House of Commons they have always held that they have the right to discuss those questions, to ask for explanations, or to refuse supplies; and many ministers have been turned out because not sustained by the House of Commons, on mere questions of foreign policy. And will it be contended that what the House of Commons may do in a monarchy, the Representatives of the American people cannot do?

We have a Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to that committee has been referred this identical message of the President of the United States, in which he strongly condemns this treaty, and says it ought to be abrogated. The rules of this House require the committees to report upon everything which is referred to them. That committee was obliged to report; and the most limited report we could make was a resolution expressive simply of our opinion. We have not gone so far as to recommend action. I think, therefore, that every gentleman will see in a moment that this is the proper mode of proceeding. We do not trammel the President at all, but propose to back him. In my judgment, the President will find, if this old stumbling block is removed, that a satisfactory arrangement may be made outside of it. Be that as it may, I am willing to leave the whole matter with him. But there are some questions of expediency of vast moment involved, and I will bring some of them to the consideration of the House.

By the abrogation of this treaty we shall open that country ultimately to the occupation of citizens of the United States. A great advantage will result from our occupation, as well to that country as to us. In all ages of the world, where the higher races have had control of the greater portion of the earth, it has been most prosperous. There are now, Mr. Speaker, four Powers which are extending their dominion over inferior races. In the northeast there is the great Russian Empire, which has sprung up in modern times, but it now holds one half of Europe, all the north of Asia, and has an area of eight million square miles, and a population of sixty-five millions, and is extending its dominion over the semi-barbarous nations of Asia. Whatever may be thought of the Russian government as compared with our own, I think that all men will agree that the system it will establish will be more stable and more conducive to the material prosperity of those countries than their present system.

The second power is that which exists in southwestern Europe on a comparatively small area. The French Empire in Europe, including the island of Corsica, consists of only two hundred and five thousand square miles—less than the area of the State of Texas. But there is in that territory a population of nearly forty million people—active, energetic, highly civilized, intelligent and brave, constituting, in my opinion, the most formidable military Power that the sun has ever shone upon. If the ascendancy of France, is not as striking as was that of imperial Rome, it is because her neighbors and rivals are vastly supe-

rior to the semi-barbarous nations over which the Roman eagles directed their victorious flight. France is now occupying northern Africa, and I have no doubt that civilization will be benefited by it.

The third power is that which rests on a little island in the Atlantic ocean—an island less than several States of this Union. But its dominions have been extended to every zone, till they girdle the entire globe. Great Britain controls a larger amount of the earth's area than has been ever heretofore subjected to one government. She has under her dominion more than two hundred million people—nearly one-fourth of the whole human race. She has subjected to her every variety of men, from the Caucasian down to the negro.

The fourth Power is that which exists on this western continent. It has sprung up so suddenly, and its progress has been so rapid, compared with the old empires, that it reminds me of the vision of Daniel, of the he-goat that came from the West so rapidly that he touched not the ground. It is only a little more than fifty years since Talleyrand said that the United States was a young giant without bones or nerves. Since that day, however, the bone has been hardening, the muscles swelling, and the sinews toughening; and the United States now stands among the great powers of the earth. We have a territory of about three million square miles—as much as imperial Rome had in her palmyest days; and though only one third as much as the territory of England or even of Russia, yet when you consider the compactness of this country and its qualities, it is vastly superior to either. At least two-thirds of the territory of the United States is capable of settlement. If it was all settled up as densely as Massachusetts and as Rhode Island are, it would have a population of above two hundred million—more than all Europe now has. We have a front on both the great oceans. We have the Gulf of Mexico—our western Mediterranean—on our southern border. Napoleon I. attempted to make the European Mediterranean a French lake, and failed in it. If the United States are true to themselves they will make the Gulf of Mexico a great American lake, supplied by that grand artery which drains the magnificent Mississippi basin. When you remember, therefore, the character of our territory, its compactness, its fertility, its favorable climate, and its productions, with its active, intelligent and moral population, it must be admitted by every one that there is no power on earth which has greater advantages than we have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we, too, have subjected to our control some of the inferior races. Let us, for a moment, draw a comparison between the United States and these other Powers. I will take Great Britain, not only because she is most like us, but because she makes the greatest pretensions to enlarged philanthropy, civilization, and general humanity, and because she holds a great variety of races under her dominion; but especially because the real question is, "Shall Great Britain or the United States control this Central American country?" Let us make the comparison, then. Great Britain has subjected to her in India one hundred and seventy millions people. The government, in large sections, owns the land, and obliges the occupants to cultivate it as tenants. Lord Brougham, in one of his speeches in the

British Parliament, said that eighteen-twentieths of the gross products of the soil were drawn away from its cultivators in certain localities. No man believes that the inhabitants of any country can live on the one-tenth of all the products, or even one-fourth, perhaps not one-half, if you take a large district into view. And therefore, according to Bishop Heber and other British writers, millions of people die in India annually from oppression and famine. Some men have said, whether truly or not I cannot tell, that the population of that country has diminished by thirty millions since Great Britain got control of it. But this much is certain: a few years ago the British government sent a commission to India to examine into its condition; and it reported that to collect taxes torture was applied to the tenants, and that hundreds of thousands of men and women die annually under these tortures, because they do not pay up their small rents.

Now, I will do Englishmen the justice to say, that in my judgment they cannot approve of any such thing. I am satisfied that the government itself does not sanction it. That country is governed by the East India Company—a great fillibustering company, chartered to acquire territory for the British government, and retained for that purpose. Corporations are habitually soulless.

Now look, for a moment, at the manner in which we have treated the aborigines of this country. Since the formation of the Constitution of the United States, I do not believe that we have ever deprived any Indian tribe of property. Wherever we have acquired their territory we have given them an equivalent. There is not an Indian tribe in the United States that has not more land than it can cultivate. And so far from compelling them to labor and pay taxes, we actually expend large sums for keeping them alive.

Again, sir, the United States and Great Britain have both been large importers of negro slaves to America. Into the United States there have been brought nearly four hundred thousand negro slaves, and they have increased to four million—ten times the original number. Into the British colonies there have been one million seven hundred thousand imported; and the proportionate increase would have made them at the present time seventeen million. But, in point of fact, there are only six hundred thousand. Into Jamaica alone, the British and Spaniards have carried eight hundred and ninety thousand negroes; and at the emancipation, in 1835, there were only three hundred and eleven thousand left—one-third of the original number. I need not enlarge on the fact of the vast increase of slave in this country, of their condition being above that which their race has ever occupied anywhere, and of their immense productions. Compare that with the degraded position of the British islands. Great Britain, however, emancipated her slaves, and the consequence has been that her colonies are lapsing into barbarism and savagery. To relieve her islands from their unfortunate and desolate condition, Great Britain has adopted another expedient—the importation of large bodies of white men as slaves, under the name of the Coolie trade.

Gentlemen may perhaps remember that during the last session I had occasion to make a speech, in which I discussed this subject. I

suppose that in the course of that speech I had commented on some of the transactions of the Secretary of State in a manner that may not have been entirely acceptable; at any rate, in two or three days after, there appeared in a newspaper in this city—a paper which represents the foreign interests always—what purported to be an extract from a report in progress in the State Department, giving an account of the condition of Coolies in Peru, and stating that they had a perfect paradise there. And this thing was published as a reply to my speech. I should not have objected to its being put in juxtaposition with it, provided they had thought proper to publish my speech, so that their readers could decide for themselves.

Now, if gentlemen will look into the seventh volume of the Commercial Statistics, they will see all the information that Mr. Marcy and his assistants were able to collect on this important subject; and it does not make one page. It would be well for gentlemen to read it, to see how little truth there may be in an official report. It deserves to stand side by side with that passage in the old geographies, which represented Indians as venturing over the Falls of Niagara, in their canoes in safety. The two statements are equally reliable. I was anxious to make a reply to it at the time: but, under the rules of the House, I had no opportunity afforded me.

I now ask the attention of the House for a few moments, while I expose one of the most oppressive, cruel, and monstrous systems that the world has ever seen carried on by any civilized nation. I shall first read a few extracts from the daily papers of the last few weeks, among the items of telegraphic and other news. I may repeat that this report represents the Coolies in Peru as having a fine time of it, and as being thriving, prosperous and happy. Whereas, in fact, it is established that of those Coolies who are imported in Peruvian ships, thirty-eight per cent., a little over one-third, die on the passage. Nor do those carried in American and British ships fare much better, as these extracts show:

“On the 19th the American ship, *Kitty Simpson*, from Swatas and St. Helena, with three hundred and thirty seven Asiatics. She had ninety-three deaths on the passage. And on the 20th, the British ship *Admiral*, with two hundred and eighty-three Asiatics. She had ninety deaths on the passage.

“It is worthy of remark that the number of deaths has always been proportionate to the length of the passage, and I cannot omit drawing particular attention to the fact that all these Asiatics brought here are males, not a single female having arrived among the twenty-four thousand and upwards that have come to this island. Is not this the very refinement of cruelty?

“Besides, this trade has not even the sorry excuse of the African slave trade. The Africans are savages, whom, it may be said it is charity to civilize and Christianize; the Asiatics are far from being savages; many of them are persons of refined habits and considerable education.”—*New York Herald*.

“CUBA—LATEST NEWS.—By the steamer *Black Warrior* intelligence has been received from Havana to the 15th instant. It is reported that two cargoes of negroes had been landed in Cuba since the last advices, and duly disposed of. Two

American ships had also arrived from China with cargoes of Coolies. The ship *Challenge*, Captain Kinney, one hundred and thirty-seven days from Swatus, landed at Havana six hundred and twenty Asiatics. During the passage two hundred and eighty-six had died." * * * *

"From the 10th of April, 1855, to the 15th instant, seventeen thousand six hundred and forty-four Asiatics have been received in Cuba for eight years' servitude, of which more than twenty per cent. have already disappeared. On the vessels engaged in this traffic, three thousand one hundred and seventeen have died during the voyages by suicide or disease, being more than one-sixth of the whole number taken on board. This does not include casualties mutinies, &c., which have caused the destruction of whole cargoes. Of some three or four thousand received previous to the 10th of April, 1855, nearly all have perished. It is not probable that a tenth will remain at the close of their eight years. It is said that an arrival of sepoys is expected, to add to the heterogeneous mixture of Cuban stock, and to carry out the extended views of British philanthropy, or policy, as it may be.—*Union, of February last.*

"BOSTON, January 29, 1858.—A letter received from Captain Ryan, of the ship *Lion*, from Hong Kong for Callao, dated Angier, November 22, states that the ship *Kate Hooper*, of Baltimore, Captain Jackson, from Macao, October 15, for Havana, with Coolies, was at Angier, November 22, waiting for men from Batavia. The Coolies mutinied and got possession of the between decks, and set the ship on fire three times, and before they could be subdued the officers had to shoot fifty of them."

"CHINESE COOLIES.—The Chinese emigrants are arriving at Havana in great numbers. No less than three thousand were landed from four ships in one week. They all readily brought twenty-two ounces a head. The most of them arrived in poor condition, which is probably owing to the Coolies being kept in dirty junks in Swatas, waiting for a vessel to bring them. At last accounts, six large American vessels were waiting for cargoes in Swatas alone. Orders have been sent from Havanna to procure twenty thousand Coolies, if possible."—*March 31.*

Some details, as given in the following statement from an English paper, may be interesting :

"THE TRADE IN CHINESE COOLIES.—The frightful mortality of Chinese on board the British ship *Duke of Portland* has been the subject of investigation for several days, before the Local Marine Board, Cornhill, London ; Mr. Duncan Dunbar, chairman.

"Captain Seymour, the master of the *Duke of Portland*, deposed that the ship left Hong Kong with three hundred and thirty-two Chinese Coolies."

He says, in his statement, one-third had been kidnapped.

"About two o'clock on the 2d I left the shore with my papers all in order, and proceeded on board the *Julindur* to get a box of musket caps, which I was rather short of. I saw the mate mastheading the topsails, and flattered myself that all was right. Vain hope ! I had not been on board five minutes when I saw the topsail halliards had been let go, and the Coolies crowding on the poop. I got on board in double

quick time, and was followed by the Captain and boats' crews from the three other ships with whom I was acquainted, and the scene of riot and confusion that awaited my arrival I shall not soon forget. The Coolies had taken the opportunity of the mate's attention being occupied in making sail, and abstracted the iron belaying pins, and armed themselves with what else they could on deck, principally firewood, and gained possession of the poop, and were yelling and shouting in a fearful manner, throwing everything moveable overboard, and let go the topsail halliards."

This mutiny was quelled by force, and they were guarded and confined :

"The third day I had the first suicide, and from that date until I passed the Straits of Sunda, I had an average of about three overboard daily. They now also commenced threatening to burn the ship, and my interpreter becoming alarmed I could not find the ringleaders. On the morning of the 15th, I discovered a plan they had laid to take the ship. One more of the invalids was to be thrown overboard, and during the absence of the boat to pick them up, the Coolies were to make a rush, obtain possession of the poop, and murder all hands, reserving the boats crew to take the ship on shore; and the same afternoon they carried their plan out; but, as I was quite prepared for them, after the failure of their attempt they became much quieter; but I had on an average from twelve to eighteen in irons for riotous behavior and attempted suicide.

"But I could fill a volume on this subject and the horrors by which I was surrounded. We lost one hundred and twenty-eight Chinese before arriving at the Havana, chiefly from congestive fever; it is like the Hong Kong fever. We lost one of the crew. I think the Coolies brought the seeds of the disease on board with them. When they would not eat I have tried to force food down their throats. We were one hundred and fifty days on our passage from China to the Havana.

"At the close of the examination of the witnesses, the chairman announced the decision of the board: 'That no blame attaches to the owner and master, or any one connected with the ship. That Captain Seymour's conduct to the emigrants appears to have been kind and attentive, and that every possible precaution was used by him to decrease the mortality.'"

Sir, if these results follow where the Coolies are treated kindly and judiciously on board ship, what are you to expect when they are ill-treated? Let us, however, see how they are treated when landed in Peru. From a publication on the subject of agriculture, guano, &c., by H. N. Fryatt, of New Jersey, I read an extract:

"Now do you wish to know how all these ships are loaded, and a thousand tons per day dug and sent from the islands? Well, there are about one hundred convicts from Peru, and about three hundred Chinamen from the Celestial Empire. The former are in the right place; the latter were passengers that engaged passage in an English ship for California, and engaged before they left their own country, to labor after their arrival for a limited time to pay their passage, (eighty dollars.) Instead of being landed at California, the ship brought them direct to this place, and the captain sold them for three and six years, according to the men to work out their passage; and here they are slaves for life. They are allowed four dollars per month

for their food, and one-eighth of a dollar per day for their labor, with a pile of guano before them which will last the next ten years; and long before it is exhausted the majority of them will be dead. Each man is compelled to bring to the shoot five tons of guano per day. A failure thereof is rewarded with the lash from a strong negro; and such is their horror of the lash, and the hopelessness of their condition, that every week there are more or less suicides. In the month of November, I have heard, fifty of the boldest of them joined hands and jumped from the precipice into the sea. In December, there were twenty-three suicides. This is from one in authority. In January, quite a number, but I have not learned how many."

Now, there are hundreds of these facts constantly published, or made known, and they do not excite any attention in this country; when, if it was known that ten negroes had committed suicide in one of our slave States, it would be published, perhaps, in every newspaper in the United States; and we should have many speeches on this floor, and elsewhere, against the horrors of slavery, &c. But these are only white men, who die under that system by thousands; and no Abolitionists, or other special friend of humanity, realizes it, or takes the slightest notice of it.

Mr. Foster. I would ask the honorable gentleman whether he intends bringing in a bill to suppress this Coolie trade?

Mr. Clingman. I will come to that point in a moment. In this matter I hope that I shall have the co-operation of the gentleman from Maine.

I also read a portion of a letter from the author of this work:

"The officers placed on these islands to superintend the delivery of the guano, in order to check this business of self-destruction, adopted the plan of rescuing the dead bodies from the sea and burning them on the guano heaps, in order to convince the Chinese of the impossibility of their return to their native country, through the gates of death; that the bodies should remain on the island. I was informed that this burning of bodies was of frequent occurrence.

"I have recently conversed with intelligent captains engaged in the Cuba trade, who tell me how the Coolie trade is done. English commercial houses have runners at Amoy, Hong Kong, &c., who are employed in enticing the Chinamen, by offers of wages, &c., to emigrate to the land of gold. They pick up the population who live outside the walled towns, the short haired, and a sprinkling of a better class, who are distinguished by the long braided hair hanging behind, and somewhat superior intelligence. All manner of inducements are held out, of course. These Coolies are furnished with rice and water for food during the passage; are treated with much severity, and frequent suicides occur during the passage. Guards are placed over them to prevent their jumping overboard, &c.; and yet, notwithstanding these precautions, about one in three either die or destroy themselves on the passage.

"The passage is five doubloons, landed in Havana, (eighty five dollars). They are sold at Havana according to quality; and the most valuable bring as high as three hundred to three hundred and fifty dollars apiece.

"The trade is done chiefly by English and American vessels; but my informants say that they never knew an American captain to bring a cargo of Coolies twice. The English are not so scrupulous.

"The Coolies are put to work alongside of the Africans, and subjected to worse treatment, as the Cooly feels his degradation and becomes sullen and melancholy. His only relief is in the old mode, suicide, which he avails himself of at the first opportunity. The *long-haired* Chinaman cuts his tail off as a mark of his degradation; and as soon as the driver sees his tail go he knows that the owner intends to depart to that bourn, &c., pretty quickly; and not alone, either, as the long tail exercises much influence over the others.

The trade being so lucrative, it is on the increase. The high price of sugar will likely add a stimulus to this new species of slave trade, which I, for one, feel much indebted to you for holding up to the execration of mankind."

I have, in addition to that, a letter from a respectable merchant in the city of New York, a gentleman of high standing. I do not give his name, but the following is a part of his letter:

"Our eastern ship owners have great horror of the African slave trade, but they have no compunctions of conscience in abducting Coolies from China and transporting them to South America. To save appearances, they land them at Arica, in Peru, whence they are transferred to the Chincha Islands, where they are worked digging guano under a broiling sun until they are driven to desperation. I had a ship, the *St. Patrick*, load at those island. My captain, Whitman, said that whenever the poor creatures could get to the cliffs, they would jump into the sea. Some twenty jumped off whilst he was there. You are not, perhaps, aware that there is no water on the islands. All the water used is taken there by the ships; and, of course, being so scarce, the poor creatures have but a limited quantity given them. And the dust arising from the guano, with the severe labor they undergo, drives them to desperation. Water must be wanted in large quantities. Your negroes at the South are in Paradise compared with the Coolies at the Chincha Islands."

Mr. Speaker, I need not enlarge on the cruelty of this system. And it does not stop here. France imported Coolies into some of her islands. In the island of Bourbon alone, there are thirty-five thousand. But England seems, in some way, to have interposed obstacles to the obtaining of Coolies by the French, wishing to have a monopoly of the business, perhaps, as she formerly had of the African slave trade.

To get rid of that difficulty, the French Emperor directed his ships to go to Africa and get negroes under the name of apprentices. The English protested against that, and said it was practically re-opening the slave trade. The *Times* thundered about it. It was admitted, nevertheless, that the Abolitionists had ruined their West India islands, and that they ought to acknowledge their fault in sackcloth and ashes; but it proposed only to restore these islands by the importation of Coolie labor. To show how the controversy is carried on, I present a few passages from the French papers. I think it will be seen that they understand the question thoroughly; and, in fact, have the advantage in the argument:

"But Africa continues to be the source whence the colonies first drew their laboring population. It is convenient to our American possessions. Its inhabitants are

gentle, robust, sociable, and inclined to agricultural pursuits. Then, in addition to this, they are oppressed and subject to the horrors of perpetual anarchy in their own country.

“Are not these reasons sufficient to induce us to look to Africa for laborers for our colonies ?

“But it is a great scandal to the superannuated society which was accustomed for twenty-five years to behold the world bow before its decrees in matters of philanthropy. What! lay hands on Africa, the holy ark which has been guarded with such an extreme jealousy, and defended still more by the prestige which it has acquired? Yet the Times thinks the present opportunity fortunate for seizing it again; and, thanks to its proceedings, Parliament already resounds with the declaration of grievances, the most grievous of which is that they cannot have laborers from Africa except they purchase them again. It is a natural result of the social state of that country. Slavery is the general condition of its working population.

“But, say the English, when you buy slaves from the African chiefs you encourage those chiefs to procure others by means of incursions, and thus perpetuate intestine wars in that unhappy country. Unfortunately, the barbarism which reigns in that continent is exercised independently of all outside pressure. When an African chief does not sell his slaves, he kills them.

“To deprive Africa of contact with civilization, under the pretext of preserving peace among her tribes, is to act like a quack, who, to cure an eruption, kills his patient by the internal concentration of the disease. The African chieftains have no motive for making war; they do so out of a pure instinct of destructiveness, and by this alone they prove themselves savages. The poor negro captives destined for human sacrifice on the occasion of some public festival, or on the tomb of a warrior, would hardly call it philanthropy to leave them to their fate under pretext of a humane objection to their purchase for emigration.

“Bible societies have undertaken to submit Africa to a *regime* of preaching, distribution of edifying tracts and saintly communion.”

“In any case, we cannot see why the ultra Abolitionists should impose their particular views upon us. Is not Africa an independent country? Is it confided to the tutelage of Bible societies? And France—cannot she act according to the dictates of her own conscience? There exists in this respect no international engagement that can limit her action. The conventions relative to the right of search have been suppressed. Engagements entered into since then have been abandoned.

“The landed proprietor is then rid of every incumbrance. Following the Times, the philanthropists have made some stupid blunders, which should force them into private life, or at least teach them to speak with becoming modesty in future. In this situation of things, when it has been proved that the system has utterly failed, is it astonishing that we should try another? This would at least have two good results. It would give new activity to colonial productions, and withdraw thousands of negroes from a miserable condition.”

I must say that I agree with the French, that all the points of difference are in their favor. The negro is not only better fitted by nature for slavery than the Chinese or Sepoys, but in fact is benefitted by it, while they are driven to suicide. The negroes, too, are slaves at home,

or captives to be put to death if they cannot be sold, while the Chinamen and East Indians are in a comparative state of freedom.

Here is a letter on the subject from Mr. Mason, our Minister at Paris, dated 19th February last, which was sent to the Senate the other day by General Cass. It is of an important character :

"In an interview which I had the honor to have with Count Walewski, Minister of Foreign Affairs, in the last week of January, I asked him if there were any objections to my being informed of the precise character of the measures adopted by his Majesty the Emperor's Government, in regard to the importation into the French colonies of negroes from Africa. He replied that there was not; and proceeded to state very frankly that the French colonies, particularly in the West Indies, were languishing for want of labor; that negro labor alone was adapted to tropical productions. I asked if there was any truth in some statements which I had seen in the English newspapers, that French vessels freighted with African emigrants would be regarded by British cruisers as engaged in the African slave trade. His Excellency said no; that there had been some communication between the two Governments, and the British Government would not object to the French scheme, while the wants of the British colonies were being supplied by the Cooly trade. The Minister urged that the plan adopted secured African labor, which was indispensable to their colonies. Thus the emigrants were free, and were rescued generally from impending immolation; that, relieved from the ignorance and heathenism of the most degrading character, they would be humanized and Christianized by being placed in contact with the French colonists."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is settled between the two countries that this system is to go on, France taking negroes and Great Britain the Asiatics. What is the field they have to take them from, and what is the extent to which the operation can be carried? In China there are four hundred million people. Great Britain is now conquering parts of the country, and will have free access to the people of the Chinese Empire. She also holds in subjection one hundred and seventy million East Indians, whom she is killing for mutiny, &c. There are at least forty million negroes on the western coast of Africa within the reach of the slave traders. You will see, therefore, that one half of the human race is open to be preyed upon in this way.

Now what is the inducement to carry on the trade? It appears that they will bring from two to four hundred dollars apiece, and the cost of transporting them from China is only eighty or eighty-five dollars, and from Africa about half that; so you will see that there is inducement enough. Here are enormous profits to be made. How many will they transport when this system is in full operation? We know that there have been half a million of immigrants brought in one year to the United States, by American ships mainly. I take it, then, that the navies of France and England, with the help of American shipping, will enable them to bring over, perhaps, a million a year—certainly half that amount. You will then, perhaps, see a vast system of emigration by which all these islands and Central America may be filled up, if not interrupted in some way, with this people. And, as they only bring males, I need not say to gentlemen that the system is more cruel than

the former slave trade. Then males and females were brought here, and there was something of a social system recognized in that trade. Then these people are to be hired out; and nobody will deny that they will be worse treated than the slaves usually are who belong to those that control them. I maintain that this system is one of enormous cruelty, as every one must see at a glance. Its subjects will, most probably, be worked to death by the time their eight or ten years' service is over.

Mr. Speaker, we have upon the coast of Africa ships to aid Great Britain in the suppression of the slave trade; and yet she is transporting men who are free comparatively, and vastly superior to the negro, and consigning them in vast numbers to the most cruel condition of slavery ever known. I submit whether it is not a mockery, whether it is not hypocritical in the United States and Great Britain to try to save a few negroes while this enormous system is going on. I say that it is as hypocritical as it would be for an individual, who had been robbing the poor of thousands systematically, to give away a few shillings ostentatiously on Sunday for charitable purposes. As we have this agreement with Great Britain, why not speak out our sentiments manfully, and tell her that, if she does not abandon this, we will withdraw our squadron from Africa, and no longer attempt to prevent the carrying away of a few negroes to Cuba, while countless numbers of white men are being enslaved!

The great objection to our acquiring Mexico as a whole, is to be found in the fact of the existence there of a large population of Indians and other inferior persons. Suppose Louisiana, Florida, or Texas, had been filled up with a large number of inferior people, which we could not reduce to subjection: that fact would have rendered them useless to the United States. On the principles of humanity, in the first place, and secondly, upon the question of expediency also, I am against this system of filling up these now thinly inhabited neighboring regions with inferior and degraded races. Gentlemen must see that it is the ultimate policy of the United States, at some future day, whether ten, twenty, or fifty years hence, to acquire the greater portion of this territory. I hold, sir, that our system will be better for that country than the system of Great Britain; and that, therefore, it will be for the interest of all that region, as it unquestionably will be our policy some day to control it.

Gentlemen may say, however, suppose that the treaty is abrogated, and England refuses to yield: will you go to war with her? That is thrown at us by way of intimidation. I have observed the course of the British Government, and they have two systems of operation against us. They may be defined as what Sammy Weller would call "insinivation and bluster." Many of our statesmen are so delighted to get compliments from the British press, and to be thought well of by British officials, that they seem to forget the interest of their own country. I remember, a few years ago, when there was an investigation going on in the British Parliament, in relation to the expenses of their missions abroad, that Mr. Packenham, who had long been a minister here, was a witness, and he was asked what expenditure paid the best? His reply was, "that spent for dinners." Whether his American experience brought him to that conclusion or not, I do not know. I confess that I appreciate a dinner

and civility as much as anybody ; but it is one thing to accept and return courtesies, and it is another to abandon the interests of one's country.

I have no doubt that every right-minded Englishman will think better of American statesmen who, while accepting the civilities of foreigners, will still stand by the interests of their country rather than sell it for a mess of pottage. When these means fail, we are to be alarmed by threats of danger from England, and sometimes with great effect on the timid. I doubt much whether any Administration we have had since John Tyler's would have had the courage to accept Texas upon her application, in the face of the British protest against it. I am very certain that some of them would have professed to be afraid, and would have declined it. I think it absolutely necessary that this country should, in some respects, take a higher position abroad. An extremely mortifying fact was brought to my knowledge the other day. A bearer of dispatches came here from St. Domingo. He called to see me, thinking that Congress might be induced to do something. He says that the American commercial agent at the city of St. Domingo, with his family, and all American citizens in that county, are actually protected from massacre by Baez and his followers, by the British consul, and by the captain of an English ship who happened to be there, and who was ready to land four hundred men to protect them. I knew that in Europe, Asia, and Africa, our citizens were in the habit of claiming to be Englishmen, in order to get British protection ; but I did not know that this system had to be resorted to in America, and almost in sight of our own shores.

Is it not time that something should be done. There has been great difficulty upon the part of the Secretary of the Navy in finding a ship to send there to protect our citizens. I think that the African squadron might as well be employed upon that service. If we will submit to indignities from white men, it is rather too much to take insults and kicks from free negroes. Cannot the Greytown affair at least be repeated in St. Domingo ?

But we are constantly met with the allegation that Congress will do nothing ; that Congress would not back the Executive. We know very well the short-comings of Congress ; but, in my judgment, there have been but few instances where the Executive has had occasion to call for, and has shown a disposition to use force, that Congress did not properly respond. Not only in the Maine boundary dispute, but during the Mexican war, the Government had everything it asked. The misfortune has been, that some of our Presidents heretofore have not shown the purpose to act, and the consequence has been, that Congress has been slow in advancing anything. Our Navy now costs \$15,000,000 a year—more than the whole General Government cost in the year 1824—and yet I am told that the Navy is not much more efficient than it was in 1816. This, if true, is attributable to the miserable system which now prevails in having ignorant clerks in the Departments at the heads of bureaus, to whom the management of the Department is committed, while the Secretary himself sometimes, not being familiar with the business, trusts it to his subordinates. I hope we shall have a reform in this respect.

As far as concerns the present Administration, it has not, as yet, had an opportunity of showing its hand upon our foreign policy. It has been occupied with certain domestic questions ; but, I think, from the antecedents of the President and the Secretary of State, we have a right to expect a more determined policy. I read last session an extract from Mr. Buchanan's Ostend manifesto. The language is so good that I desire to repeat it again. On the 18th of October he says :

"Under such circumstances, we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us. We forbear to enter into the question, whether the present condition of the island would justify such a measure? We should, however, be recreant to our duty, be unworthy of our gallant forefathers, and commit base treason against our posterity, should we permit Cuba to be Africanized, and become a second St. Domingo, with all its attendant horrors to the white race, and suffer the flames to extend to our own neighboring shores, seriously to endanger, or actually to consume, the fair fabric of our Union."

These are bold and striking words.

What are the views of our Secretary of State—the learned, accomplished veteran, Cass? Gentlemen will remember that in 1848, when he was before the country as the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, he took ground in favor of the occupation of Yucatan by the United States troops ; and only two years ago, in a letter to New York, he uses this language :

"I am free to confess that the heroic effort of our countrymen in Nicaragua excites my admiration, while it engages all my solicitude. I am not to be deterred from the expression of these feelings by sneers, or reproaches, or hard words. He who does not sympathize with such an enterprise has little in common with me.

"The difficulties which General Walker has encountered and overcome will place his name high on the roll of the distinguished men of his age. He has conciliated the people he went to aid ; the government of which he makes part is performing its functions without opposition, and internal tranquility marks the wisdom of its policy. That magnificent region, for which God has done so much and man so little, needed some renovating process, some transfusion by which new life may be imparted to it. Our countrymen will plant there the seeds of our institutions, and God grant that they may grow up into an abundant harvest of industry, enterprise, and Prosperity! A new day, I hope, is opening upon the States of Central America. If we are true to our duty, they will soon be freed from all danger of European interference, and will have a security in their own power against the ambitious designs of England far better than Clayton-Bulwer treaties or any other diplomatic machinery by which a spirit of aggression is sought to be concealed till circumstances are ready for active operation."

Such are the views of General Cass. Now, sir, I propose to this House simply to respond to the views of the President's message, by indorsing them, condemning this Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and leaving him to take the necessary steps to rid us of it. I have no fear of any war arising out of the subject. Great Britain has vast pecuniary and

commercial interests involved in her relations with the United States, and it also would be very difficult for her to defend Canada and her other possessions against us. She is not rashly going to war with us. At this very time she is engaged in a Chinese war, and an East India war, and is, in addition to that, threatened with European difficulties. She, therefore, has no motive to seek war with us. The present English Cabinet is believed to be favorable to a liberal settlement of this question. Let us go forward and get it settled now. It is not, at this time, of much practical importance, and, therefore, it may be the more readily adjusted. If it is not done, in the future, when a practical question shall arise in relation to it, it may involve us in war.

Mr. Bliss. I have listened with a great deal of attention, but do not understand what the object of this movement is. Do I understand the gentleman as advocating a policy leading to the seizure of Cuba and Central America?

Mr. Clingman. No, sir.

Mr. Bliss. What, then, is the idea?

Mr. Clingman. It is to abrogate this treaty.

Mr. Bliss. But all the gentleman's argument is directed to explaining our standing and position in respect to Cuba and Central America; and, as I understand it, no sooner is the Kansas question disposed of, than this Cuba and Central America question is raised, for the extension of slavery.

Mr. Clingman. I cannot answer for the gentleman's understanding. This may not be a matter of very great practical importance now; but it is my judgment that, ten, twenty, or fifty years hence, it may be our policy to acquire those territories, and I desire to remove obstructions now.

As I said before, suppose, when Great Britain protested against the annexation of Texas, a treaty had been enforced binding us not to acquire it: its annexation would, in that event, have led to war. The infraction of a positive agreement with her, in addition to an act to which she was hostile, must necessarily have led to war. We had no obligations in the way, and no rupture resulted. I desire to remove all offensive alliances which shall stand in our way hereafter.

Mr. Giddings. I desire to ask the gentleman whether he is to be understood as advocating the annexation of Cuba, or whether he discards that idea?

Mr. Clingman. I will answer the gentleman with pleasure, though I do not desire to embark in the discussion of that subject. I will say that I should be very glad to see Cuba annexed to this country. I would have been glad to get it upon fair and honorable terms four years ago, and I think the country ought to have taken it upon the happening of the Black Warrior affair. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty does not touch Cuba. We could get Cuba without abrogating this treaty. I care nothing in the world about it so far as Cuba is concerned. I should like to see Cuba a part of this Union. Its annexation would also stop the African slave trade and this more objectionable traffic in Chinese and East Indians who are carried there and destroyed. Would not the gentleman like to see an annexation of Cuba by which the slave trade and the Coolie trade would be stopped?

Mr. Giddings. I do not rise to embarrass my friend. I would ask him this question: is he in favor of the acquisition of Cuba now?

Mr. Clingman. If the gentleman will point me to any honorable mode by which we can get Cuba, I will give that mode my support this very moment. If the Executive can make a treaty with Spain for Cuba, I would favor that project, provided the equivalent were not unreasonable. Some time ago I offered a resolution calling for information on Spanish affairs, but I understand that it is inexpedient to furnish that information up to this time. If our difficulties with Spain are not settled, I am willing, in the ultimate stage, to go to war with her, and then, if we can conquer Cuba, I will not complain of that result.

Mr. Giddings. I understand the gentleman to refer to the Ostend circular

Mr. Clingman. I do.

Mr. Giddings. Does the gentleman approve of the terms of that document?

Mr. Clingman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Giddings. That will answer my purpose.

Mr. Clingman. I think I go quite as far as Old Buck does in this line. I have, Mr. Speaker, nearly used up the time which, by the courtesy of the House, has been given to me, and I must bring my remarks to a conclusion. All I desire is for the House fairly to indorse the position assumed by the President.

Mr. Davis, of Maryland. Let me ask my friend to explain one point. His resolution speaks of abrogating the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Does he contemplate that the President, by his own authority, shall do that, or that negotiations shall go on to that effect?

Mr. Clingman. The President has said, in his message, that it ought to have been abrogated long ago by consent of both parties. I have good reason to believe—I wish I could state all the reasons for my belief—that the British Cabinet are tired of the negotiations which have been going on for eight years upon this subject, and that they are now ready to adjust the question on honorable terms; and I have no doubt that the Executive, by proper effort, will be enabled to do it at this time. I do not know that it could be done twelve months hence, or at a later day. But, by its abrogation, every gentleman will see that we will get rid of the shackles that now clog us, and be left as free from entangling alliances with European Powers as we had been from the days of General Washington down to the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. Barksdale. Does my friend mean to intimate that Great Britain is willing to give up Roatan?

Mr. Clingman. I will answer with pleasure. Great Britain, by the Dallas treaty, agreed to give up Roatan to Honduras, provided there was a guarantee that slavery should never go there. The United States would make no such guarantee, and that treaty was rejected. I have no doubt, however, that Great Britain will, in view of her treaty with Honduras, agree to abandon her claims in that quarter, and also withdraw on reasonable terms, her Mosquito protectorate. The feeling of the American people is against this Clayton-Bulwer treaty. Its current is setting so strongly in that direction that no one can expect to change it. Let the Government, then, do its duty, and we are again free, and the path of destiny is open before us. [Here the hammer fell.]

SPEECH

AGAINST PROTECTIVE TARIFFS, DELIVERED IN THE SENATE
OF THE UNITED STATES, FEBRUARY 10, 1859.

The Senate having resumed the consideration of the following resolution, submitted by Mr. Bigler, on the 31st of January:

Resolved, As the opinion of the Senate, that the creation of a large public debt in time of peace is inconsistent with the true policy of the United States; and as the present revenues are insufficient to meet the unavoidable expenses of the government, Congress should proceed without delay, to so readjust the revenue laws as not only to meet the deficit in the current expenses, but to pay off the present debt so far as it may be liable to immediate cancellation.

MR. CLINGMAN said:

MR. PRESIDENT: I hope not to occupy the Senate at as great length as the gentlemen who have proceeded me on this question. The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Bigler) remarked, in opening the debate, that he was acting under the instructions of his Legislature. My colleague and I have, likewise, been instructed to oppose all increase of duties upon the products of mining and manufacturing, and to insist upon making railroad iron free of duty. Here is a collision between States, and the appeal must be to reason.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. Toombs) who yesterday occupied the floor, covered a portion of the ground which is necessary to be occupied on this question; and everybody knows that where his scythe has gone, there is not much left for anybody to glean. Feeling relieved from a part of the task I had undertaken, I expect to speak more particularly to another branch of the subject. The President of the United States has recommended specific duties. He makes no express recommendation for an increase of duties, or taxation.

But the friends of higher protection have seized upon this occasion, and are making an effort to get increased duties. The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Bigler) says that he, with his friends, will be satisfied with fifteen dollars a ton on bar iron; and his colleague (Mr. Cameron) says eighteen dollars is necessary. We all know iron is worth but little more than thirty dollars a ton in England, and this amounts to fifty or sixty per cent. on its value. It is an increase, therefore, of more than double the present rate of duty, which is twenty-four per cent. The real question is, whether we are ready for that? They say it is necessary to protect American labor. How do they propose to effect it? Is not the case fairly stated in this way? A man in the northwest last year worked very hard, and by his labor produced four hundred bushels of wheat, worth \$400. Another man in the South, working equally hard, produced eight bales of cotton, worth likewise \$400. Each of these men proposes to exchange his

product for bar iron, and an Englishman stands ready to give them ten tons of it for his product; but a Pennsylvania iron-master says: "This man is a foreigner; I am your countryman; trade with me." They assent to it, and an exchange is proposed between them. He says: "My iron costs me more to make it than the English iron costs its manufacturer, and I cannot let you have more than seven tons." They decline his offer, and are not willing, in this way, to lose the value of three tons of iron. He then appeals to the government to impose a duty, or tax, of thirty per cent. on all purchases from the English, and it is done. One of these men says: "I shall lose the value of three tons, if I trade with the Englishman; I may as well trade with you. Take my wheat, and give me seven tons of iron." The Pennsylvanian, however, says: "I have supplied myself with wheat from my neighbor already; sell your wheat for money, and then buy my iron." He then goes to the Englishman and asks cash for his wheat, but is met with this declaration: "I could give you ten tons of iron for your wheat, but I am not prepared to pay you the money." Suppose, however, he does succeed in selling for cash; if he then purchases the iron from the Pennsylvanian, he loses three tons; and if the other planter does likewise, he loses the value of three tons of iron also. I use this simple illustration, but it is a fair statement of the case; and the result is, that each of those individuals loses the value of three tons of iron, and the manufacturer gets six, and the government receives not one cent. That is the policy to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Cameron) is endeavoring to drive us, by excluding foreign productions altogether. If, however, it should turn out, as is usually the fact, that the Pennsylvanian has only seven tons of iron and cannot supply the demand of both, then one of these men has to purchase of the foreigner, and the result is, the government gets the value of three tons in duties; the Pennsylvanian gets three tons as protection, and these individuals lose six between them.

Now, Mr. President, it is very easy to see that if the object of this taxation was to support the government, these two individuals might pay the tax with half the expenditure to themselves. They have to pay, on the one hand, to the government, and on the other, to the manufacturer, an equal amount. As the government received the value of only three tons, half that sum, paid by each of them, would have answered the purpose. For example: the importations last year of tea and coffee were about twenty-seven million dollars; and the consumption of sugar likewise about twenty-seven million dollars. Now, suppose you want to raise \$5,000,000 by a tax; if you impose it on tea and coffee, and the consumers pay that amount, the government gets all of it, because those articles are not made in the United States at all. Suppose, however, you impose the duty on sugar: they pay the \$5,000,000, but one half of it goes to the sugar-planters, and the other half to the government; because about one half the sugar consumed is made in the United States. In fact, the government would receive only \$2,500,000; and hence, to get \$5,000,000, you would have to make the tax twice as high as if it were placed on tea and coffee. In other words a duty of ten per cent. on coffee and tea would give the

government as much money as would twenty per cent. on sugar, because half of the sugar tax would go to the planters and makers of sugar.

But, sir, to return to my illustration. If these two individuals should complain of that, the Pennsylvanian tells them: "My iron establishment furnishes employment to American laborers." One of those men may say to him: "I keep a blacksmith's shop where the iron is worked up into plows and hoes and axes, and used as industrial tools; and this furnishes the means of employment to many." The other one says: "We are making in my section a railroad; we are leveling hills and filling up valleys, to lay down iron rails as fast as we can get them; we employ now a vast amount of labor in making the road; and when we get it done, we shall open a market for our productions to the sea side, and in that way encourage all kinds of industry." It is demonstrable that the creation of a railroad will cause a larger demand for labor than the iron furnace where the rails are made. Then, what becomes of the argument as to the protection of American industry?

They say, however, that they afford a home market at their manufacturing establishments. But, in fact, the northwestern man, when he gets his wheat to Chicago, can have it carried to England as easily as to the Pennsylvania iron establishment; and even if he should carry it there, nine times out of ten they do not want it, because they are supplied by persons in the neighborhood. It is the same with cotton. It goes from Southern ports to Europe as cheaply and easily as it does to the manufacturers in the North, and the great bulk of it necessarily goes abroad. The burden, therefore, of this system is spread all over the country; the benefit goes to the manufacturers and to those in their immediate locality. How much is this whole burden? I have taken pains to collect some facts, which I can present in a few minutes, and which I think will enable Senators to form some tolerably accurate idea of the amount which it costs the country. Before doing so, allow me to say one word as to the two rival theories on this subject.

There was a distinguished South Carolinian—one of the ablest debaters ever known in this country, or in any other—I mean the late Mr. McDuffie—who advocated a theory which was known as the forty-bale theory, and derided by its opponents. I do not refer to it because I think it sound; for I regard it as demonstrably erroneous in part; but a reference to it will enable me to explain what I think the facts will show to be the true theory of this system of taxation.

Mr. McDuffie declared that the case could be so clearly stated that he never had seen it tried before a popular assembly without producing universal conviction. His statement was something like this: a company of manufacturers, which he located in the North, would manufacture goods to supply the State of South Carolina; another company of planters there undertook to produce cotton, rice and tobacco, to exchange them for goods to supply the demand of the same locality. He supposed each of these companies to bring in \$100,000 worth of their goods. When the manufacturing company bring in theirs, they can sell them at once, as there is no tax upon them; but let the export-

ing company or company of planters bring in their British goods, which they have obtained with the products of their own industry, and the custom-house officer says, "Before you sell these goods you must pay me forty per cent."—that was about the rate of duty in his day—that is \$40,000 on the \$100,000. These men have already paid \$100,000 in England, and they have to pay \$40,000 to the government. If they sell for \$100,000, as the Northern company does, of course they lose \$40,000; they realize but \$60,000. Everybody sees this must be so in the case stated. He argued that that was the true theory of the system; that for example, if they sold to the merchant, the merchant finding this burden was to fall on the goods, would give no more than they could realize; and even, if in the large way, you import specie, very soon you will import as much as can be used profitably, and thus raise the price of articles at home, which we must consume; while our own productions were sold in foreign markets at the low rates there. In other words, he insisted that the import and accumulation of specie here would, in the end, produce a state of things which did not change the result of the case stated by him.

The error of this theory, as a whole, is obvious. Suppose the price of these goods should be increased in value; suppose this company, when they introduced them, should be able to sell them for \$140,000, by adding the duty to the price; then they would lose nothing; the government would get its \$40,000. The manufacturing company would likewise sell at the same price, and make a clear profit of \$40,000. Thus the whole \$80,000 would fall upon the consumers of the country. That is the theory of the gentlemen on the other side, who contend that the enhanced price falls on the consumers entirely.

But let us take one step further. Suppose these planters themselves consume the goods; and we know that in the United States most men consume nearly as much as they sell, perhaps ninety-five per cent of it on the average. If they, therefore, should consume these goods, of course they would pay the \$40,000 increased price by reason of the duty; and thus they lose \$40,000, either as producers or consumers.

There is one other view to take of the question. Let us assume now that the increase in price is less than the amount of the duty; what will then be the effect? Take it at twenty per cent.; suppose they are able to sell their goods for \$120,000. They gave \$100,000 for them in England, and \$40,000 to the government for duty, and sell them for \$120,000; and they will still lose \$20,000 as producers; but if they consume the goods they likewise lose \$20,000 more as consumers, so that they must lose \$40,000 in any event; but the manufacturer may make a large profit. If he consumes them all he will lose nothing. His profit, though, will depend on the amount of his sales above his consumption, and we know in fact he, as a manufacturer, makes large profits.

Then, Mr. President, I maintain that whatever burdens are levied by the tariff must be paid either by the producer of the articles sent abroad and exchanged for the dutiable goods, or it must fall on the consumers of the imports. It is usually divided between them, but they must pay it. Hence, when the farmer or planter furnishes the

exports, and also consumes the imports obtained for them, he must pay this tax; and thus the system, either way, is just as oppressive to him as Mr. McDuffie supposed. If this be true, the facts ought to verify the theory; and it is on this point that I present some statistics for the consideration of the Senate. I first ask the attention of Senators to the prices of cotton during a long period.

It was said, Mr. President, by a distinguished statesman, Mr. Fox, as great a debater as England ever produced, that as to questions of political economy and tariffs, he did not pretend to understand them, because the facts were too complicated. Since his day, however, a great deal has been done in the collection of statistics; and I now propose to show that the successive tariffs have operated unfavorably on production at home—I mean on the domestic imports sent abroad; and I think I have facts enough to present to satisfy every Senator on that point. It is sometimes said that you can show anything by the prices of cotton, for you find cotton high and low under all sorts of tariffs. That is true, if you take a short period, as it may mislead you, because there are disturbing causes. The amount of the production, the extent of the demand, and financial difficulties affect it. In a long period, however, these disturbing elements will be neutralized. By a wide induction science arrives at the truth. Suppose it were desirable to compare the amount of rain which falls at Washington with some other place in the tropics; you could not determine it by an examination of a short period, because there are, in succession, rain and sunshine and storm and drought in all counteies; but if you could ascertain how much rain fell here and at some other point for the last ten or twenty years, it would be an exact measure of all that is to fall in a future period of similar length. If you want to determine which of two localities, or which of two occupations is the healthiest, you cannot do it by observing a small number of individuals; but if you take a large one, it is found there is almost mathematical accuracy in these comparisons.

In this way let us look at the effect upon cotton in this instance, because the statistics as to that are more complete than those of other products. I present a table covering a period of thirty eight years, in which I have grouped the average price of cotton during the continuance of each successive tariff:

Average price of Cotton.

From 1821 to 1824 inclusive.....	15 cents.
“ 1825 1828.....	13.4
“ 1826 1828.....	10.9
“ 1828 1832.....	9.7
“ 1833 1837.....	14.3
“ 1838 1842.....	10.8
“ 1843 1846.....	7.0
“ 1847 1851.....	9.5
“ 1851 1858.....	9.96
“ 1847 1858.....	9.8

The first high tariff, or one of a protective character, within the range of this list of prices, was that of 1824. I have the average price of cotton for the four years which preceded that tariff. From 1821 to 1824, inclusive, the price was fifteen cents a pound. That was the average through the whole period.

In 1824, a tariff was passed increasing the duties largely, and that continued for just four years up to 1828. In 1825, Senators remember that there was a remarkable speculative rise in the price of cotton. It went up during part of that year very high, and averaged twenty cents a pound for the whole year. That rise was purely a matter of speculation, and it fell again soon after. Nevertheless, including this year of speculation in the four, cotton fell during these four years to thirteen and four-tenths cents per pound. If, however, we exclude this year of speculation, and take the other three years, its average price was only ten and nine tenths per pound, or nearly sixty per cent. less than before the existence of the tariff.

In 1828, another tariff highly protective was passed, and that continued just for years. From 1829 to 1832, the average price of cotton was nine and seven-tenths cents, another large fall consequent upon the passage of a higher protective tariff. In 1832, Congress modified the tariff by making a large free list; and in the winter of 1833 following, passed Mr. Clay's compromise, making great reductions. That continued in force for ten years, until the tariff of 1842. Now, for a reason immediately to be stated, I divide this period into two of five years each. I find that from 1833 up to 1837, cotton rose to fourteen and three-tenths cents—an increase of forty per cent. on the previous prices under the high tariff; at the end of that five years, to wit, in 1837, there was a remarkable monetary convulsion. It is well known to gentlemen all around, that the State bank deposit system, which was then tried, led to an enormous expansion of the currency. The deposit banks themselves had issued thirteen dollars in paper for one in specie. There was a crash, or break up, and for the next four or five years, prices were very much reduced. This was the case both in England and in the United States, and it affected cotton and everything else; but, nevertheless, for the five years from 1837 up to 1842, the price of cotton was ten and eight-tenths cents, considerably higher than it was under the tariff of 1828, which had preceded it.

In 1842 was passed a highly protective tariff, prohibitory on many articles, and that endured four years. We were told the other day, and it is often said from time to time, that this tariff of 1842 restored prosperity. I do not believe a word of it. The country had been laboring for four or five years to get out of debt, and the people had done so, and business was ready to revive again. But let us see how cotton fared under the four years of that tariff. From 1843 to 1846, it was at seven cents a pound—a heavy fall upon the prices during the hard times previous. In 1846, the tariff was modified by a large reduction of duties, and we have had that tariff in operation nearly ever since. In the first five years following that reduction, from 1847 to 1851 inclusive, I find that cotton rose to nine and a half cents a pound—a large increase; and taking the seven years following, up to the present time,

it is nine and ninety-six hundredths—say ten cents a pound; and if you take the whole twelve years from 1846 to the present time, we find that it averages nine and eight-tenths cents a pound—just forty per cent. higher than it was under the tariff of 1842.

You will come to the same result if you take the years of large productions in each period, or take those of small production and high prices, as I have found by taking the average. In other words, any gentleman will find that as the tariff was high, cotton was low; and the reverse.

Now, remember, sir, we have gone over a period of thirty-eight years, and six distinct changes. There was the condition which preceded the tariff of 1824; then, secondly, the condition which followed it; thirdly, that of 1828; fourthly, that of 1832-'33; fifthly, that of the tariff of 1842; and, sixthly, the period since, under that of 1846. If you go through all these periods, you will find the changes exactly as I state. But the case does not rest on this alone. Let us look for a moment at other products. I will not weary the Senate by going into details as to them; but I say, and each Senator can verify it for himself, if you take all the exports, during the four years of the tariff of 1842, of cotton, rice, tobacco, and everything, you will find that they brought \$30,000,000 less annually than they would have done at the prices of the previous four years; and if the products which were sold in the four years that followed the tariff of 1846 had been sold at the prices of 1842, they would have brought \$30,000,000 a year less. That is to say, taking a period of twelve years, the four intermediate ones of which were occupied by the tariff of 1842, it will be found that, during its existence, we were losing \$30,000,000 a year on our exports.

But, sir, not only were the prices lower under the high tariff, but as the tariffs were reduced, the exports largely increased in quantity as well as in value. I find that during the existence of the tariff of 1842, the amount of breadstuffs which were sold for those four years averaged only \$18,000,000 a year; and for the twelve years since they have averaged \$46,000,000—two and a half times as much. It may be well enough to remark in this connection, that, for the last five years, flour has been fifty-four per cent. higher than it was during the operation of the tariff of 1842; tobacco one hundred and fifty per cent. higher. Rice, and everything else, has advanced. And if you take all the exports under the tariff of 1842, their whole amount is just \$110,000,000 a year upon the average, and the imports \$108,000,000. For the last five years the exports are \$316,000,000, on the average, and the imports \$308,000,000. In other words, in twelve years, while the population of the country had increased not quite forty per cent., we have had nearly three-fold increase in our exports and our imports.

We have seen that we appear to have lost \$30,000,000 a year, by the tariff of 1842, on those exports of \$110,000,000. If you applied the same rule to the present one, we should be losing nearly \$90,000,000 a year; that is, if the products sold for the last five years had been sold at the prices which prevailed under the tariff of 1842, the country would have got about \$90,000,000 less for them. This, too, recollect, is a comparison between two protective tariffs: that of 1842 was very

high; that of 1846 is moderately high, though it was a step in the direction of free trade. Now, suppose we could take the whole distance; suppose we could actually come to free trade: there is not a Senator here who has ever made the comparison, who will not say that the step from the tariff of 1846 to free trade is a longer one than that from the act of 1842 to that of 1846; in other words, if we gain \$90,000,000 a year by substituting the duties of 1846 for those of 1842, we should gain more than \$90,000,000 by coming to free trade. In point of fact, I have no doubt that we lose \$100,000,000 a year, or more, as producers, under the operations of the present tariff.

But gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber say that all this is a mistake; that the burden falls on the people entirely as consumers. Well, let us look at their theory for a few moments, and see if it will help them any. We have collected more than \$63,000,000 of taxes by means of the tariff of 1846, in one year. That sum is first paid by the importers; but the importers put a per centage on the goods when they sell to the retail dealers; and the retail dealers put a large profit, generally more than fifty per cent., on the price when they sell to the consumers: so that if you put all the profit of both these classes, you will find that the \$60,000,000 paid to the government costs actually more than \$100,000,000 to the consumers. There can be no doubt about that. The consumers of the country are obliged to pay more than \$100,000,000 when the government gets \$60,000,000, from imposts. That is equal to more than \$400,000 to each congressional district.

But the case does not stop here. The manufacturers likewise receive a large profit. I should like to know how much they estimate it to be worth. They tell us all around if you repeal the tariff their business will be ruined. They tell us that they supply three or four times as many goods as are imported. In fact many of the merchants inform me that they believe two-thirds of the dutiable goods are made in this country. If that be the case, and the price is enhanced to the same extent with the duty, there must be, at the least, two hundred million dollars more to fall on the consumer. I do not think it amounts to that much; I think it probable that many persons who are near the factories purchase rather cheaper on that account. But suppose you take it at the sum of \$134,000,000; that, added to the other now paid to the government, makes the entire amount of \$234,000,000, or \$1,000,000 to each congressional district. But, if it be assumed that the bounty paid to the manufacturers is only as much as the tax paid to the government, it will amount to \$200,000,000 in all, or above eight hundred thousand dollars for each congressional district in the United States.

Now, gentlemen will tell me that this must be a mistake; that the people would not pay so much. Sir, they would not if they knew it. Let us consider it in this way for a moment. The importers now pay these duties, and they charge them to the consumers as a part of the price; but suppose you reverse the mode, and put your tax collectors at the little retail stores; you place a man, I say, at every retail store in the country to collect there the duties; he looks on and charges the

taxes according to the purchases; he says to one man, you have bought a dollar's worth of sugar, and you must pay me twenty-four cents tax on that; to a second, you have purchased five dollars' worth of iron, you must pay me \$1 20 on that; to a third, you have bought ten dollars' worth of broadcloth, pay me \$2 40; to a fourth, that salt you have bought is worth two dollars, I must have forty-eight cents tax on that: if it were done in that way you would see an excitement. It would be aggravated, when, for example, the man who paid taxes on iron saw that his neighbor came in and bought a quantity of copper and paid no taxes at all; the man who paid taxes on sugar saw that somebody else bought tea and did not pay anything on that; and they all saw the manufacturers come in and get their dye-stuffs and chemicals and "free wool," and whatever else they wanted to use, without paying anything at all. Does not every Senator see that this has to be paid, in fact, and that it is wholly immaterial whether it is paid by the importer, and thrown on the consumer in an increased price of the article, or collected in the way I have described?

I say then, Mr. President, that whether you adopt the theory that the producer pays a large part of this, or that the consumer pays it all, it leads you to the same result. Gentlemen say that the tariff does not raise prices at all on the consumer. That was the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Bigler) the other day. If it does not, why do they want it? If it does not raise prices on the consumer, is it not obliged to fall, in the case stated by me, on the home producer? Somebody has to pay for it. You cannot throw much of it on the foreigner. I admit that by crippling trade, you injure him to some extent; you diminish somewhat the amount of his sales, and hurt him somewhat; but as he has all the markets of the world to choose among, of course your duties will not damage him much. I say, then, these gentlemen have to choose between two views; either that the producer pays a large part of this, as I contend, and as the facts which I have produced, and which I challenge them to meet and explain away, show, or it all falls on the consumer. If it falls on the consumer, you have a burden of \$200,000,000 on the whole country. Who gets the benefit? The government receives \$60,000,000, and the manufacturers get the rest. The manufacturing establishments are located in New England, New York and Pennsylvania, mainly, and some in New Jersey. Thus about one-third of the Union gets all the benefit, while the burden falls on the Northwest and the South—two-thirds of the country.

I have thought that some of our Southern men made a mistake in former arguments on this question. They endeavored to make it appear that it was a Northern and Southern question. The tendency of that was to array the whole North, as a body, in favor of protection. It is my deliberate judgment, that the Northwestern States suffer quite as much as any part of the Union. They are far in the interior, and these taxes are accumulated by successive profits. I have no doubt they suffer more than the Atlantic States, but all the agriculture of the country is heavily oppressed in this way. Remember, too, that agriculture is the great business of the country.

But, sir, I have shown that our exports and imports have largely increased under lower duties; I might refer also to their effect on our tonnage. I find that the tonnage in 1821 was 1,298,000, tons and in 1846, 2,562,000 tons, not quite doubling in twenty-six years; and in 1858, it is 5,049,000 tons, nearly double what it was in 1846; that is, the increased tonnage in twelve years, under the tariff of 1846, is as great relatively, and much greater absolutely, than it was in the previous twenty-six years.

But gentlemen tell us that this system of trade is ruining the country; that we are creating an immense foreign debt; and the Senator from Pennsylvania, the other day, said that that we were buying more than we could pay for. Why, Mr. President, if you look to our exports for the last five years you will find that they exceed the imports. He says our people can only consume nine dollars' worth annually per head of foreign articles. How does he arrive at that result? Under some of the previous tariffs men were not able to consume, and did not consume, more than four or five dollars' worth; but suppose you say to a farmer, "now you are eating and drinking too much; you are living too high;" can he not, if true, reply to you, "I pay for all these things with my crop, and have a surplus besides." If the Senator from Pennsylvania will compare the exports and imports he will find that the exports, according to the statements made, actually exceed the imports; and hence, we may well say, that as long as our people are able to pay for all they use, they are not buying too much.

Under the tariff of 1842, there were \$2,000,000 more of exports, on an average annually, than imports, as shown by the Treasury report. For the last five years there are \$8,000,000 more, pretty nearly the same proportion. But the old idea of the balance of trade has been too often exploded to require refutation here. Everybody knows that if our imports were not, in fact, more valuable than our exports, we should lose money upon them. For example, a ship takes a cargo of cotton from New York, goes to Liverpool, buys British goods, and returns. If those goods were worth, in fact, no more than the cotton, there would be a loss. There is the use of the ship, the pay of the captain and the men, the insurance, and all the profits to come into the account. In point of fact, our imports must, in the long run of years, exceed the exports; and that they do not do so on the Treasury tables, I have no doubt, arises from the fact that there is smuggling and undervaluation; but that seems to have existed in about the same ratio under the tariff of 1842 and that of 1846.

There is especially a complaint against the British trade, which, it is said, is ruining the country. Why, sir, we sold last year to Great Britain \$187,000,000 of our products, and bought \$127,000,000—I mean, the whole British dominions took from us exports, to them, of \$60,000,000 more than our imports from them; and with England alone the difference is \$61,000,000. If you take our trade with the British dominions, as shown in the commerce and navigation reports for the last four years, you will find that we sell them, on an average, \$44,000,000 in each year more than we buy for them. There is, in fact, a large specie balance due us from England. Where does it go?

Our commerce with Cuba is the other way. We sell Cuba only half as much as we buy from her. The same condition of things exists with reference to China, and other nations; and it is only by means of this balance in our British trade that we make up the deficiency without exporting specie.

But gentlemen refer to the fact, that specie is constantly going out; and they say that we are being ruined by this system. They forget that, in the last ten or twelve years, the United States has become a great gold producing country. We produce \$50,000,000 a year, or more, of gold. We cannot use it all; and it is just as necessary to export our surplus gold as our surplus cotton. Notwithstanding the large exports of gold, we find that there is a constant accumulation of specie in this country under the system of free trade, as it is called. For example, in 1846, the specie in the country was estimated, by the Treasury Department, at \$97,000,000. It is now at least \$350,000,000. In fact, if you make a reasonable allowance for what emigrants must have brought to this country, I should not be surprised if it is \$400,000,000. Thus, while our population has increased less than forty per cent., the amount of specie in the country, in twelve years, has increased nearly ten times as much.

But how has it been with the manufacturing establishments themselves? While every body is prospering, how has it been with them? If we are to believe the statements of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, and others, who speak on this subject from time to time, they are in a most lamentable condition. We are told, ten years ago, that the iron business had all been broken down. We have been told, in each successive year, that it has been ruined. If a man merely heard the speeches made on that side, he would come to the conclusion that there was not one pound of iron made in the United States.

Looking, however, to the census, I find that, in 1840, there were made in the United States two hundred and eighty-six thousand tons; and, in 1850, ten years afterwards, after a trial of four years of the tariff of 1846, it had increased to five hundred and sixty-four thousand tons, or double; and in 1855, they say themselves it has run up to a million of tons. Here is a business that has gone up in fifteen years from two hundred and eighty-six thousand tons to a million, or a four-fold increase. Now, I ask what branch of business has progressed more rapidly? The production of cotton has not equaled it. Take agriculture, generally, and it falls far behind it. There has been an enormous increase. I find that, according to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury in 1847, the exports of iron, and articles made of iron, were \$1,167,000; and in 1858, \$4,729,000—an increase of three hundred and five per cent. in eleven years. Does that look as if the business was failing?

But we have some other data that will aid us in coming to a conclusion on this point. I find that the census of 1850 represents the wages of men engaged in the iron establishments at \$1.06 a day in Pennsylvania, while the male labor engaged in the cotton factories of that State get only sixty-five cents a day. They pay laborers in the iron establishments, therefore, fifty per cent. more than they pay those in

the cotton factories. It may be said that the labor in the iron establishments is a different kind, and therefore you must pay more; but when I come to look at the prices paid in North Carolina, I find by the census of 1850, that in the iron establishments in North Carolina, the price of male labor was thirty-nine cents a day, and in the cotton establishments forty-three cents—very little difference, but cotton the highest. In Georgia, the iron labor is forty-four cents and the cotton fifty-five cents. It appears, therefore, that in Georgia and North Carolina the prices paid in the cotton factories to male labor, and in the iron works are about equal; in Pennsylvania they pay fifty per cent. more to labor in the iron factories. That proves that the iron business is most profitable in that State. These being the prices in Georgia and North Carolina, in 1850, they must have been about the prices of agricultural labor; that is, the farmers of the country were realizing only some forty or fifty cents per day, while in Pennsylvania men in the iron establishment were making more than a dollar per day.

Now, what justice is there in taxing men who are not making more than fifty cents a day, for the benefit of those who are making more than a dollar? The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Cameron) said that the people of his State were standing idle, and were looking to the President to do something for them; that if he would work as hard for them as he did for the Lecompton bill, they would have a good time of it. Sir, I was reminded of Falstaff's speech, so often quoted: "Hail, when thou art king, rob me the exchequer." These Pennsylvanians, according to the statement of the Senator from that State, say to Mr. Buchanan, "You are now President; plunder the people at large for our benefit." According to the showing of the Senator himself, we are told that if you were to repeal the tariff, or if you do not increase the duties, the people will all quit making iron. I do not believe a word of it.

Mr. Bigler. Who said that?

Mr. Clingman. I do not know that my friend said it; but I ask him whether he said that the iron business would be abandoned if you resorted to free trade? Has he not heard it said often?

Mr. Bigler. I want to remind my friend from North Carolina that whatever I may have said on the general subject of the prostration of the iron business at this time, I did not discuss that matter at all; I made no allusion to it. I did not want to speak of what would be the condition of affairs if the tariff were suspended; but I said that it was erroneous to assume, in reference to iron and other great staples, that if the home productions ceased entirely, and the tariff was cut off, they could be purchased at twenty-four per cent. less in consequence.

Mr. Clingman. Well, I will ask the Senator whether he has not often heard it said, and whether he did not hear it suggested by his colleague and others? But I have better evidence even than that, in the memorial which has been sent here, and which the Senate has been appealed to, to reprint at this session—I mean the old memorial of the iron convention which met in 1849, and which lies on the table now. I find, on looking at it, that they go into a minute statement of the cost of making iron; and how much do they put it at? They say that

they cannot possibly make iron for less than \$49 a ton at the works, and that it costs \$4 75 to get it to market; and hence, when they sell iron for \$55 a ton, they only clear \$1 25 on it. At the very time they sent this memorial to us, you could buy merchantable bar iron in Liverpool at \$26 or \$27 a ton, and, duties off, get it here for about \$34; so that, according to their statement, it is necessary that we should impose a duty of \$20 a ton to enable them to make it at all. They said it could not be reduced for this reason, that the price of wages was so high in this country, that in England they could get for \$3 71 as much labor as was gotten for \$11 in the United States. They told us further, that the cost of making iron was mainly in the labor; that nine tenths of it was labor, and the rest material. It turned out by their own showing, that the British, at their price of labor, could produce iron at \$20 a ton as easily as they could at \$50. If that be true, will any gentleman contend they were going to continue the business if the tariff were repealed? No, sir; according to their own showing. But though that idea has been preached to us again and again, I do not believe a word of it. In point of fact, I do not think there is that difference in wages. The Senator from Rhode Island who sits near me, (Mr. Allen,) who is particularly well-informed on this subject, has told me again and again that he has noticed for years past that the prices of wages in the establishments of England, and he gets them frequently, do not average generally more than thirty per cent. and he is confident not as much as forty per cent. below the prices of labor in this country.

Remember, we have now a duty of twenty-four per cent. on iron; and besides that, the cost of putting it on ship-board, and freights, and every thing else, as estimated by an iron committee from Pennsylvania, and I think correctly, amounts to as much more. They gave me a statement, for my use, some sessions ago, and they showed that the cost of importing it, independently of duties, was equal to twenty-seven per cent. on the then price of iron. It was a little lower then than now. My friend from Georgia suggests that putting a duty on that cost would make it twenty-five. If you take either twenty-four or twenty-five per cent. as the duty, and add it to the twenty-seven, you have fifty-one or fifty-two per cent. Our producers, therefore, have, under the present tariff, in our own ports, an advantage equal to fifty per cent. over the foreign producer. If they actually paid forty per cent. more in wages, they would still have largely the advantage; for they admit, themselves, that the raw material is cheaper in this country than in England; so that they ought to make a profit at a price largely under the present rate. That accords with the statement I produced, that the iron production has increased four-fold in the last fifteen years. Everything goes to show it. If you swept away the tariff to-day, it is possible some few weak establishments would go down, and it might reduce the price of wages; but I do not know that it would.

To prevent misrepresentation, I say that I should be gratified if the iron men of Pennsylvania could get not only one dollar, but ten dollars, for every day's labor; but the question is, will you tax men who are not making fifty cents a day, perhaps, all the year round, to enable others

to get more than a dollar a day? Suppose you repealed the tariff altogether, and wages were reduced a little: they would still get nearly twice as much as the agricultural laborers of the country. Do you think they will abandon the business? Why, sir, there are many parts of the United States where men have raised corn when it was worth only ten cents a bushel. I know it used to be the case out in Kentucky. I do not know what the present prices are, but corn was produced and sold at ten cents a bushel; and those Kentuckians not only pursued the business, but they used to fatten large numbers of hogs and other stock, and drive them six or seven hundred miles to market. They used to drive a hundred thousand or more through the little town in which I live, going South. These men worked as hard as any on earth; and they are the men to be taxed on their iron, sugar, and other articles of consumption, to enable somebody else to get enormously large profits. That is the point of view in which I oppose the system. It is to benefit a few large iron-masters and other manufacturers.

But again, sir, we are told that raw materials ought to be made free. I will give very briefly the different excuses of the manufacturers for an increase of taxation. They present many plausible arguments to us. What are raw materials? I suppose that the common understanding is that they are articles which, in their present state, are to be worked up into a better thing. According to that standard, coal and iron are raw materials for the manufacturer of pig metal, and they ought, therefore, to be free. Well, pig metal is raw material for the manufacturer of bar iron, and Scotch pig, and all other pig ought to be free of duty. The bar iron that he makes is the raw material that the blacksmith works up and sells to the farmers for plows and hoes and axes. Ask a farmer what are the raw materials he requires for a crop, and he will answer, that they are his manure, his working tools, his stock, and his labor. The great working agent in this country is man; and what is necessary for his subsistence, I think, ought to come in as raw material—the provisions, clothing, and everything he uses. Why shall not these go into this working machine? Are you to say that everything is to be free which facilitates reproduction? for I suppose that is about the idea of some political economists. They divide consumption into that which is productive and that which is unproductive; and the result is that you will have to make everything free, except perhaps jewelry and pictures and statues, a great part of which are now in fact free. The whole idea of drawing any such distinctions is preposterous. It is a cunning excuse of manufacturing gentlemen, who want to get what they wish to use free of duty. They do not intend to pay any part of the taxes themselves, but they mean that they shall be thrown heavily upon other people.

There is another of their peculiarities and misfortunes that I must comment upon. They tell us it is a great universal law, that whenever you tax a thing, you ultimately make it cheap. I have said to some of these gentlemen, you want your raw materials, your chemicals, your dye-stuffs, &c., all very cheap; now let us tax them. The very moment you put this question to one of these gentlemen, he gets indignant. He is just as indignant as a quack would be, if told to take his own medicine. If it really be true that they are laboring under a misfortune of

this sort, that the great universal laws of production will not benefit them, they deserve to be pitied.

I remember the fable of a man who prayed to Jupiter to pass a law by which he should never be capable of being wet in any way. He found it convenient at the time; but in the end, the suspension of the general law as to him was very injurious, and he prayed to be restored to the common lot of mankind. Now, if there be any device, or if Jupiter can help us in any way to put these manufacturers in a situation where the great laws of trade and protection will operate in their favor, I hope it will be effected.

I say, if you want to get money, put your tax upon the free list. The importation of articles on the list amount to \$80,000,000, and a portion of that, about twenty million dollars, is specie. There is about sixty million dollars besides, on which duties might well be levied. Tax that; let wool and chemicals, &c., be taxed. But the manufacturers ought to be in favor of it; for, if they believe in their own doctrine, those things will be cheap enough in a few years. Most of them can be produced in the United States. It is true, some of them cannot be had here; but will they endeavor to persuade the country that copper cannot be obtained in the United States? Will they say that most of these chemicals cannot be produced here? Will they tell us that wool cannot be grown in the United States? The whole idea is preposterous.

But sir, there is an effort to make the impression on the public mind, that the late disturbance in trade has been produced by the tariff of 1857, or at any rate by low duties. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, he shows clearly that it could not have been by the tariff of 1857, because the whole imports that year were seventy-odd millions less than they had been the previous year. If we imported less, and also got the goods cheaper—and that is the theory—of course it has not hurt anybody. I account for it in a very different way. I attribute it not to the foreign debt, because our exports have been exceeding our imports, according to the Treasury statements, a little more than they did formally; I do not believe there is any large foreign debt existing in balances in this way. But our Americans are fond of speculation: they are enterprising; and when they get credit they run it to a great extent. I have no doubt many men in New York have imported goods on credit, supposing they would be able to make a profit and to pay for them; but the great indebtedness has been in the country; and you can only prevent that by stopping our credit system. You will always be liable to revulsions, under an extended system of credit, and you will not get rid of them by a tariff. You may go back to the tariff of 1842, and they will occur. I admit the vicissitudes will not be as great. In other words, if you leave the country free, men in times of prosperity, are more likely to go too fast, just as a man whose limbs are free, is more apt to move too fast than one who has a mill-stone on his back. If you hobble your horses to prevent their running away, they must travel very slowly at all times.

If gentlemen can succeed in crippling trade, as they seek to do, by high protective duties, I think it quite likely that these revulsions will not be so decided; but remember, this is the recession of an advancing wave. There is an advancing tide going forward very rapidly; occa-

sionally it may come back a little; but I know of no mode of preventing this, unless you can diminish the credit system in this country. Probably the bankrupt law, which the Senator from Georgia introduced, or some such measure as that, applied to corporations, might answer the purpose; but when you propose that, it will not meet the views of gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, who represent the tariff interest. In my judgment, the reason why we are recovering so rapidly from the late financial revulsion, is owing to the fact that, under the sub-Treasury system, and the change in the system of deposits, we have a large amount of specie, so that there is a very rapid recovery. I deny that there is any general indebtedness between this country and England, growing out of the operations of trade.

As far as the South is concerned, it never was in so healthy a condition. That remark was true a year ago or more. In fact, so sound was the condition of the Southern States, that it struck them with profound surprise when this revulsion came on. We have had large exports of cotton for the last two years, and very small imports. Large balances are now outstanding in our favor, and I have no doubt on earth that the importations of this year will be very large, because the quantity of goods now on hand has been greatly reduced.

There is one sort of indebtedness which exists, and, which cannot be prevented by Congress. I mean the borrowing of money in Europe. The State of Pennsylvania has borrowed thirty or forty millions. My own State has borrowed some. Nearly all the States have borrowed. That has created a very large debt there; but if the money has been well spent, it has added to our prosperity. I maintain, then, that under our existing system, independently of this borrowing, there would be no indebtedness in Europe; but it ought to be the other way.

I confess that I attribute a great deal of the large imports and exports, for the last ten or twelve years, to our railroads. I find that in France, in 1843, when they had next to no railroads, all the exports and imports were \$435,000,000 a year. They have now gone up to \$920,000,000. They have more than doubled in that country. You have the same effect here. By enabling the people to get their produce to market, they sell a great deal more and at better profits. This will strike the mind of every man at once.

Then, why should we not make railroad iron free of duty? We have paid, I believe, in the last seventeen years, twenty millions and upwards of duties on railroad iron. It was estimated a few years ago that all the capital invested in the iron manufactures was only \$20,000,000. In ten or twelve years' time, at the rate at which we have been paying for the last few years, we should pay duties enough to buy out all the iron establishments. I do not want them discontinued or bought out; far from it, but I submit to Senators whether it is a wise policy to cripple the industry of the country in this way, by a tax upon railroad bars which these men admit they cannot make as cheaply as we get them elsewhere.

Mr. President, I have occupied more of the time of the Senate than I desired to do. I have touched on some points that, it struck me, might be important to bring to the attention of the public. The question now before us is, shall we increase the revenue at all? I agree with the argu-

ment of the Senator from Georgia, that there is no necessity for it; but if you do increase it, begin with the free list. We are threatened with an extra session unless something is done. Now, for one, I am willing to keep the Treasury notes outstanding, but if the question comes whether we shall vote higher duties upon those articles now paying more than twenty per cent., it shall not have my vote as long as I am in the Senate, even at the hazard of an extra session. It will be very inconvenient to me, as to everybody else, to have one; but if it is narrowed down to that issue; if there be a combination of gentlemen on the other side who are opposed in policy to me on this question, and who want to get an increase of duties, with a few members of the Democratic party, to force an issue of that sort, let it come. What is the attitude we shall stand in? The Democratic party will stand upon the principle of reducing the expenditures and keeping down the taxes. If gentlemen on the other side choose to adopt the other line, and say they go in for higher taxes, and, therefore, large expenditures, very well; for you know, and everybody knows, that these large expenditures have grown out of a surplus.

It was just so in 1837. We had a large surplus then, and the Government got to spending too much money. Hard times came on, and Mr. Tyler went through his administration of four years, according to my recollection, with only \$22,000,000 a year, on an average. We have had another surplus for a few years, and expenditures have increased. They commenced in Mr. Fillmore's administration. There was then a surplus. They grew rapidly. They have continued since. I am not going to inquire who is most to blame; but I say, without fear of contradiction, that any man who will examine the Journals fairly, will find that the major part of the expenditures, which in my judgment are useless, have been sustained by the votes of the Opposition—such as the land grants, payments for custom-house buildings, and improvements in the interior. There may be exceptions; but it will generally turn out that they vote in a body for an increase of expenditure. It is true, after they put these things in the appropriation bills, they sometimes draw back, allow them to be defeated, and oblige the Democrats to come in and put them through; but when you come to look into the Globe, and scrutinize a little closer, it will be found that these gentlemen, as a body, go for expenditures; and why?

I remember conversing with a prominent member from New York, some years ago, about the homestead proposition. I expressed some objection to it. "Now," said he, "I have a reason for going for it, that will not bear on you." "What is it?" I asked. "Why, we are getting \$3,000,000 a year from the public lands, and I want to stop that, so that we can increase the tariff; that is what I am driving at." You hear that said very frequently; I have heard it twenty times during the last few years; and the actions of these gentlemen speak louder than their words. They struggle to have large expenditures as an excuse to keep up the taxes. As was well said by my friend from Georgia, they think taxation a great blessing. It is a blessing no doubt to the manufacturer, who obtains the advantage of it, and to a few men in his locality; but it is, in my judgment, a great curse to the country. If the issue is to be made on low taxes, and thereby small expenditures, (for we can reduce

the expenditures if there is no surplus of money,) or high taxes and large expenditures, I am perfectly willing to meet gentlemen on it.

I have endeavored, Mr. President, to show that, as the tariff has been high, productions have been low in price, and the reverse, running through a period of thirty-eight years; but that, even if you adopt the consumer theory, this tax is a burden on all parts of the country, while the benefit goes to the manufacturer; that manufactures are flourishing and prosperous; that all those that can support themselves are doing well; and, if there is any branch of industry that cannot support itself without the aid of taxes on other interests, let it go down; that during the continuance of the existing system our specie has accumulated until we have four times as much as we had only twelve years ago; that our commerce, tonnage and everything else, is increasing at enormous rates; that manufacturing establishments are doing well; and that, in my judgment, there is no need of any further increase of the taxes; and I mean, by my vote, to resist it as long as I can.

[The manner in which the Kansas difficulties had been treated by the administration of Mr. Buchanan had in all respects been most unfortunate, and had upon the whole greatly aided the purposes of the anti-slavery agitators. In the first instance it will be remembered that the President sent Robert J. Walker there with certain instructions, which, taken in connection with the speeches made by him to induce the people there to make Kansas a free State, caused great complaint, especially in the South. It was said with much truth that if Congress was not by its laws to interfere with the right of the people to settle the question for themselves, it was still more objectionable for the executive to interfere to control the action of the citizens there.]

So decided were the remonstrances, and so evident did it become that Mr. Buchanan had made a mistake, that his action was suddenly reversed, and he immediately exerted himself to produce a different result. The truth of the old adage that two wrongs will not make a right was never more clearly made manifest. The action of the President had greatly complicated matters there, and the attempts made in Congress to sustain his course tended to divide and weaken the Democratic party, and at the same time in the North generally, greatly strengthened the anti-slavery party. Many of the Northern Democrats, seeing that they must as a party go under in that section, if they attempted to follow Mr. Buchanan's new lead, took ground against it. Mr. Douglas was especially prominent in assailing the President's Leecompton policy. The breach between them gradually became wider, and seemed likely, if it did not disturb the unity of the party, at least to give its adversaries the advantage. Outside of the influence which Mr. Buchanan's official patronage gave him in the North, the majority of the Democrats there rather sympathized with Mr. Douglas. In the South the contrary was the case, and it seemed to be Mr. Buchanan's purpose to drive Mr. Douglass as far as possible, and, in fact, out of the party, if he could do so. Several of Mr. Douglas' speeches, on the other hand, were of such a character as to weaken, greatly his hold on his former friends in the South. Indeed,

his enemies charged that his wish was to divide the party, and become, as Fremont had been made, the candidate of the so-called Republican party. Though for the time both Mr. Buchanan and Douglas seemed anxious to aggravate the contest, yet the great body of the Democracy, both North and South, were desirous of closing the breach, so that the National Democracy might present an united front to the common enemy.

Hoping that this might be effected, a few days after the exciting debate of February 23d, 1859, in the Senate, I had a conversation with Mr. Douglas. I stated to him that while he well knew that I, in common with most of the Southern Democrats differed with him, General Cass, and most of the Northern Democrats as to the construction of the non-intervention policy, that we had all, nevertheless, agreed on a general line of action in the conventions which nominated Pierce and Buchanan; and that the question was not then a practical one, and in fact a dead issue. I said to him in as decided language as I could command, that nevertheless, by discussing the question, he could keep it alive, and give Mr. Buchanan the advantage against him; that Mr. Buchanan's official patronage gave him great influence over the press, &c. I told him that while we in the South generally did not agree with his views any more than we did with Buchanan's first Kansas policy, yet we were generally willing to ignore the difference of opinion, and stand on the old platform as against our common adversary.

To illustrate my views I presented this case to him: "When you were a candidate for Congress, you were supported by the members of all the different religious churches who agreed with you in politics; but suppose you had daily in your speeches insisted that all the churches were in the wrong except one of them, for example the Baptist, and that everybody would go to perdition unless he joined that church; you would thus, by making such an issue, have driven off Presbyterians, Methodists and others from you; so now by pressing this territorial question, you will not change the opinions of the Southern people and some in the North, but you can drive them further from you, and enable your enemy to triumph over you." He seemed struck with the views I presented to him, and declared that he would let the question rest.

It was not without surprise, that in the summer, while in Europe, I saw that he had re-opened the controversy, by having an article published in *Harper's Magazine*. The wisdom of Job's prayer that his enemy might write a book was never, perhaps, made more manifest. He thus had given his adversaries just such an opportunity as they needed. Mr. Douglas, though a most powerful debater, was a weak writer. Unfortunately for him, too, he fell into the hands of Judge Black, the ablest controversial writer of the day.

On my return to North Carolina in November, at Raleigh, I had a conversation with Governor Ellis and Mr. Holden, then editor of the *Standard*, (who afterwards became Governor). They said, "We attempted to follow your advice and prepare the State to support Douglas, if it should become advisable, but he has placed himself in a position where it is impossible to sustain him." I told them that at any rate we must endeavor to harmonise the party for common defense against the Black Republican organization.

Some additional circumstances tended to weaken Mr. Douglas. General Frank Blair and others made statements tending to show that Mr. Douglas had been willing to become the candidate of the Republicans. An impression existed in the minds of many that while such a movement had been favored by Mr. Greely and a

number of the party, that Mr. Seward and others had resisted and defeated the project. Mr. Douglas' failure to contradict the positive statements of Frank Blair created doubt in many minds. Under all the circumstances, nevertheless, I preferred that if it were practicable to do so, that Mr. Douglas should be made our candidate for two reasons. In the first place, he had the most positive strength in the North, and his position on the territorial question might tend greatly to secure the doubtful votes of such persons, as from their conservative feeling were hesitating to join the Abolitionists. Secondly, from Mr. Douglas' impetuous temperament and his location in the northwest, he would not only, if defeated, have gone with us, but also he might have either carried some of those States to us in the South, or at least, in the event of a collision, have divided them.

It will be remembered that a number of prominent anti-slavery men had hired a ruffian, John Brown by name, to collect a band of desperadoes, and in the night time to enter Virginia at Harper's Ferry, murder some citizens, occupy some houses, and attempt to excite an insurrection among the negroes. And yet a crime like this, so unprovoked, so deliberate and so atrocious, instead of creating a feeling of universal indignation even in the North, had, in fact, rendered the perpetrator a hero, and greatly strengthened the Abolition party there. This fact alone, showing as it did that the feeling in the North was so strong against the South that any crime committed against our section was applauded there, it would seem, ought to have united the whole South for its common defense.

In the hope that by fairly presenting the issue as it then stood, and holding up the danger that seemed to stare us directly in the face, and unite the Democracy of the North and South, on the 22d of January, 1860, the following speech was made:]

SPEECH

AGAINST THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY PARTY, DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 16, 1860.

Mr. CLINGMAN said:

MR. PRESIDENT: It is my purpose to speak to-day of the condition of the country, as connected with agitation of the slavery question. I shall do this with perfect frankness, and with no reserve, except what parliamentary rules and Senatorial courtesies impose. By such a course only can the real nature of the impending evil be ascertained and a remedy suggested. Having carefully studied the subject during the greater part of my political life, and from different points of view, I intend to express my opinions seriously, and as fully as the occasion seems to require.

Before speaking directly to the merits of the subject, I shall devote a few minutes to a preliminary question. It has been contended that the Democratic party is responsible for the anti-slavery agitation of the North. A retrospect into the past will vindicate it most triumphantly

from the charge. The course of the old Federal party, in the war of 1812, had brought it into discredit and disgrace with the American people. Its leaders, with a view of recovering the popular favor, and through it the control of the government, seized upon the occasion of the application of Missouri for admission into the Union, and, by appealing to the anti-slavery feeling of the Northern States, created a sectional party powerful enough to prevent, for a time, the admission of the State. During the struggle, a provision was adopted that slavery should never exist in the territory west of Missouri and north of the line of latitude of $36^{\circ} 30'$. Though this arrangement was distasteful to the South, and by many regarded as dishonorable and unconstitutional, it was acquiesced in for the sake of peace. And when, in 1845, Texas was annexed to the Union, by the Democratic party mainly, this Missouri line was extended through it, and slavery, which legally existed in every part of that State, was abolished and prohibited north of the line.

When, subsequently, territory was acquired from Mexico, the Democratic party, with but few exceptions, attempted to apply the same principles to it, and extend the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ through it. The proposition was again and again brought forward by the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) and others, and as often rejected by the combined votes of the entire Whig party of the North, and a portion of the Democrats of that section. After years of fruitless struggle it was abandoned, and the principle of congressional non-intervention adopted by the compromise measures of 1850.

In other words, it was then established, in substance and effect, that the people of the Territories, free from all congressional legislation on the subject of slavery, should regulate it for themselves, subject only to the limitations of the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the courts of the country. This settlement, like the proposition for the extension of the Missouri line, was resisted by the great body of the Northern Whigs, who were for the Wilmot proviso and against the extension of slavery in any mode. It was also opposed by the Southern *friends of the Missouri line*, who preferred that system to congressional non-intervention, and who still cherished the hope that it might be adopted. In the final struggle, they were reduced to a dozen Southern Senators and thirty Representatives, of whom I was one.

I call the attention of Senators to another striking fact in this connection. It is charged not only by the Northern opposition, but also by the Southern opponents of the Democratic party, that it is respon-

sible for the alleged evils of congressional non-intervention and the disturbances of so-called "*squatter sovereignty*" in the Territories. I affirm that, in 1850, when this system was adopted, it was sustained by the representatives of the Southern Whigs with the greatest unanimity. I was no exception to this remark, for I had announced already my separation from the organization of the Whig party. I repeat that the Southern opposition of that day, under the lead of Mr. Clay, were the first portion of their fellow-citizens to abandon the Missouri line and support the principles of non-intervention by Congress. On the other hand, the last and the firmest friends of the Missouri line were those represented in the Nashville Convention—whose *ultimatum* it was—and such Senators and Representatives from the South as were in that day denounced as *ultras* and *fire-eaters*, because of their not adopting the principle of congressional non-intervention in lieu of the Missouri line. When these facts are remembered, will the present Southern opposition, and its organs continue to assail the Democratic party for an act which they themselves earnestly and unitedly concurred in? Can *they* take the ground that it was right to abolish the Missouri line, in order that free States should be made south of it, but that it should not, in like manner, be obliterated to place the South on an equal footing north of it? After a majority, both of the South and of the Democratic party, had adopted the principle of congressional non-intervention, we who had opposed it acquiesced, and the Democratic and Whig conventions of 1852 both sanctioned it.

When the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska were admitted, the Democratic party applied the same principle to them; and, in so doing, found it necessary to repeal the old Missouri restriction, in order that there might be *no intervention by Congress* to control in any way the inhabitants of those Territories. Were they not committed to do this, in the strongest and most emphatic terms, by their platform and their late action as to the Mexican territories, while the Whig or Opposition convention had professed, in its platform, to have acquiesced in the same principles? But it is said that both parties had declared themselves opposed to a further agitation of the slavery question. So they had; but there was a *specific pledge* in favor of congressional non-intervention in the Territories; and the carrying it out ought to have produced no opposition whatever, and would not, in a healthy state of public opinion in the North. The Democratic party could not honorably avoid doing what it did; and would have been liable to the charge, had it failed to do this, of shifting its principles from time

to time, and so shaping its course as to favor non-intervention when it would thereby admit free States into the Union, and of going *for congressional intervention*, on the other hand, when it might thereby prevent the formation of a slaveholding State. Had it failed to maintain its principles on this occasion, it would have been justly exposed to this charge. Their opponents in the North, however, on the repeal of the Missouri restriction, raised, at once, an immense clamor, showing that their friendship for non-intervention was only pretended, and that they had acquiesced in the measures of 1850 only because they created a free State south of $36^{\circ} 30'$, and did not intend the principles to be applied in a case in which, by any possibility, the South might carry its institutions north of this line. We all know that, prior to 1854, they as regularly and vehemently denounced the Missouri compromise as they have since done the *Kansas iniquity*; but as soon as it was proposed to repeal this restriction to carry out the principle of congressional non-intervention, they suddenly became the warm advocates of this same Missouri line, and deplored its removal. From the first to the last, they showed themselves to be Free-Soilers, and determined to exclude the South from all share in the public territory of the Union. While the Kansas bill was pending, they threatened to hire men to occupy that Territory; and did, in fact, send bodies of armed ruffians to hold it by force, constituting, as the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) said, a military occupation. This movement provoked retaliation; and the strife thus occasioned was referred to by them as evidence against the policy of non-intervention. By the same effort on their part, they could have created disorders in any State of the Union, and might, with as much justice, have attempted to discredit the principle of State sovereignty. In fact, they refer to the late invasion of the State of Virginia, by some of their employees, as an argument against the state of society prevailing in the South.

It is undoubtedly true, however, that in consequence of the repeal of the Missouri restriction, true and patriotic men were defeated at the North by Free-Soilers and Abolitionists. When the Democratic party had the manliness and the statesmanship to reform the currency system in part by the adoption of the sub-treasury plan, it sustained severe losses for a time. In the more arduous undertaking of placing the slavery question on a permanent and solid basis, with reference to the action of the Federal government, it has had to encounter, perhaps, greater difficulties. I am not sure, however, that it would have been as much weakened, but for accidental circumstances which it

could not foresee. During the excitement arising out of the repeal of the Missouri restriction, there occurred that singular organization called the American party, which carried a majority of almost every one of the Northern States. It severed, during this period of excitement, and permanently separated from the Democratic party, many who would otherwise have returned to it. On its sudden collapse, most of its members in the free States united with a few outside Abolitionists and formed the present Black Republican party. But for these occurrences, I have no doubt that the Democratic party would have, ere this, recovered its ascendancy in several of the Northern States.

But again, Mr. President, when, in the year 1857, Robert J. Walker was made Governor of Kansas, he publicly declared that the climate of that Territory fitted it only to be a free State; and also assured the people that the whole Constitution should be submitted to them. This position was condemned generally, in the South, as amounting to executive interference, or intervention with the right of the citizens of the Territory to decide these questions for themselves. By way of defence for Governor Walker, it was said that a number of Southern men had expressed the opinion that it would be a free State. Every one saw, however, that if Governor Walker had taken the other side, he might, with even more plausibility, have declared that Kansas ought to be a slave-holding State, because it was on the same parallel of latitude with Missouri, Kentucky, Virginia, Maryland and Delaware, all of which were slave-holding States: and this position of his might have been fortified by any number of declarations of prominent Free-soilers and Abolitionists, to the effect that, under the Kansas act, that Territory would inevitably be a slave-holding State. The entire South, almost, condemned his position as being unfair, and an unjust exercise of executive influence in the Territory. It so happened, however, that, for months, the paper at the seat of government, and others supposed to represent the views of the President, sustained in the strongest and most emphatic terms, the position of Governor Walker. Almost the entire Democracy of the free States, therefore, took this ground in support of what they understood to be the views of the administration, and assured their fellow-citizens that the people of Kansas were to have the privilege of voting on the whole Constitution of the State.

But, toward the close of that year, the Convention of the Territory decided to submit only the slavery clause to the voters generally. The President, therefore, recommended the admission of the State under

the Constitution so adopted. That this recommendation of his was right, I never doubted; because I think it has been fully settled by the usages of the States, that their conventions may submit or not, as they choose, either the whole or a part of their constitutions to a vote of the people. Nevertheless, this position being inconsistent with that which had been so generally taken in the North, many men who zealously sustained it, were afterwards defeated at home, because of their party having been previously committed to a different line of policy. I know that many Southern men who had no doubt that the action of the Kansas Convention was theoretically, and as a matter of constitutional law, right, nevertheless regretted that action, because it had the appearance of seeking to avoid an opportunity for a fair expression of the popular will. While we held that Congress had no right to interfere with the action of the Territory in this respect, yet we felt that the issue was one which was injuring our friends in the North, and could not possibly benefit us. If there ever had been any chance of its becoming a slave State in fact, the course of Governor Walker had already cut that off by carrying over all the officials and their influence in the Territory to the side of the free State party. With no purpose to cast censure on any one, I nevertheless frankly refer to this as a circumstance for which the Democratic party, as a whole, are not justly responsible, but which aided the anti-slavery party, as at present organized. On a survey of the entire ground, I maintain that it will appear that the action of the Democratic party for the last fifteen years on the slavery question, has been wise, patriotic and statesmanlike.

I proceed, however, to the consideration of the great question, before the country. Immediately after the presidential election in 1856, I met the veteran Secretary of State, then a Senator from Michigan, on the floor of the Senate, and in reply to an inquiry as to how he was, he answered: "Well in health, but depressed in spirits. Sir," said he, "I formerly thought the Union would never be dissolved; but I am now not without painful apprehensions of a different result. They say that the excitement in the North has grown out of the Kansas bill. A hundred Kansas bills would not have produced this result. These people mean to abolish slavery in your section. You may think that they are not fanatics; but the misfortune is that they are are. You will gain nothing by making to them concessions; you cannot thereby help us; but you will ruin yourselves. By standing firm, you can at least protect yourselves."

His words made the deeper impression upon me, because they were in accordance with my own settled convictions. But now the evil has attained such alarming dimensions that it demands consideration. When a dark and rapidly advancing cloud has already covered half the heavens, and the mutterings of the distant thunder, and the wailings of the coming storm are loudly heard, none but a false sentinel will proclaim a calm. Eminently futile, too, and mischievous, are declarations of Southern men against agitation and in favor of union and harmony. When a man is threatened with violence, will he stay the hand of the assailant by proclaiming his love of peace? When a country is invaded by a public enemy, can the inhabitants protect themselves by passing resolutions in favor of peace and harmony? All the world regards such things as evidence of weakness or cowardice, and as only calculated to stimulate the invaders. When Philip of Macedon was threatening Greece, his hired partizans recommended repose and quiet, and denounced Demosthenes as a political agitator. It was in the midst of men who were crying out "peace! peace!" that Patrick Henry thundered that there was "no peace!" If the Abolitionists in the North could be induced to abandon agitation on the subject of slavery, it would be well; but they reject with derision the suggestion, and become only more insolent as Southern men cry out the louder for quiet and union.

When, some twenty-five years ago, the Abolition society at Boston, under the lead and guidance of a British subject, attracted public attention, though it declared that its purposes were merely peaceful, and intended to persuade men to liberate the slaves, yet so insignificant in numbers was it, that the candidate for Congress in that district refused to reply to its interrogatories, or to give any pledges as to his course on the subject of slavery. For this he was complimented by Harrison Gray Otis, who, nevertheless, said with prophetic sagacity:

"And can you doubt, fellow-citizens, that these associations will act together for political purposes? Is it in human nature for such combinations to forbear? If, then, their numbers should be augmented, and the success they anticipate realized in making proselytes, how soon might you see a majority in Congress returned under the influence of the associations? And how long afterwards would this Union last?"

Though few in numbers, the Abolitionists went resolutely and actively to work.

There was a strong feeling in favor of liberty pervading the public mind generally, while its attention had never been called to the

specific differences—physical, mental, and moral—existing between the white man and the negro. The point of operations selected was one remote from negro slavery, where the people were ignorant of its actual features, and thus fitted more easily to be imposed upon. In that vicinity, too, were the remains of old prejudices against the Southern section of the Union. The effort of the Abolitionists was directed to the corrupting of knowledge at its fountain heads, by the diffusion of publications directed to that end. Its first fruits were seen in its influences on women, preachers, teachers, and professors, persons of lively sensibilities generally, not so much accustomed to deal with matters of fact, more easily deluded by cunningly devised sophisms, and more frequently acting from the influence of feelings. Soon abolition sentiments appeared in books of education; got possession of schools, colleges, and churches. As its powers increased, its efforts were multiplied, until it covered the land with its publications. Some twelve months ago, it was stated in the newspapers that one of the anti-slavery organizations had resolved to circulate, during the following year, in the State of New York, one million of its tracts. Can such an amount of printed matter as this, consisting as it does of ingeniously written misrepresentations and falsehoods, fail to produce some effect? Remember that this is repeated from year to year, and aided by hired and voluntary lecturers, speakers, and preachers. Abolitionism to a great extent, pervades the literature of the free States. So strong is the feeling against slavery there, that the writers of novels and plays, to secure the public patronage, exercise their wits in imagining all that can be conceived as worst in human nature, and represent it as a true type of the state of society in the South. The bulk of the newspaper press, too, in the North is anti-slavery. Such is the character of the entire press of the dominant party there, and of a large portion of the neutral and religious papers; while a part even of the minority, or Democratic press, avoids the subject as much as possible, instead of attempting to stem the current. Though Northern city papers are much read in the South, on the contrary, our papers have little or no circulation in the North. If they had, the efforts of the anti-slavery party would, to some extent, be counteracted. The cities of New York and Philadelphia, for example, are not abolitionized; and this is attributed, by some, to the fact that they are engaged largely in Southern trade. But the mechanics of Massachusetts are just as much interested, and yet they are intensely anti-slavery in their feelings. The true solution, I think, will be found in the fact that

these cities are the resort of so many Southerners; that our state of society is thereby better understood, and cannot be so successfully *defamed*. The same reason applies to the free States on the borders of the slave-holding country. It is not, as the Abolitionists allege, that their consciences are so much blunted that they cannot appreciate the evils of slavery; but simply because they do understand it, that they cannot be imposed upon by the falsehoods of the anti-slavery writers. In addition to this reason, the Western States have a large influx of Southern emigrants. While Vermont is intensely abolitionized, New Hampshire, adjoining it, is less so. This may be accounted for from the fact that New Hampshire was originally strongly Democratic, and its press resisted, therefore, to some extent, the statements of the Abolitionists. Had not New Hampshire been a small State and surrounded with adverse influences, she would probably not have been overpowered.

The anti-slavery movement has gone on with increasing strength, until it has educated a large portion of the Northern people to entertain feelings of hostility to slavery and the Southern States. The movement has progressed independently of political occurrences, but it has occasionally been accelerated or retarded by them. For example: in 1850 it was weakened somewhat, partly by the great discussion at that time, which enlightened partially the popular mind, and also by the peculiar character of the legislation of the period. California was admitted as a free State, with boundaries reaching far south of the Missouri line, and giving the North the majority in this body; while the principle of non-intervention applied to Utah and New Mexico was regarded as a fruitless abstraction, the general opinion prevailing that, to use the words of Mr. Webster, the law of God had excluded slavery from them. As to the fugitive slave law, it was seen that it could practically, like its predecessor, the act of 1793, be rendered a nullity by State action and individual resistance. It is a great mistake to suppose that the repeal of the Missouri restriction in 1854 produced the present anti-slavery organization. In 1847 and 1848 the House of Representatives, by large majorities, repeatedly passed the Wilmot proviso; and this was understood to have been done in accordance with the wishes of their constituents. Prior to 1850, most of the churches had been divided by this issue.

From year to year the anti-slavery sentiment acquired more and more political influence; and in 1848 it took possession of the greater portion of the Whig party in the free States. No one was so influential in effecting this result as the Senator from New York. In a speech

delivered during that year in Ohio, the object, in part, of which was to induce the anti-slavery men to join the Whig party rather than the Buffalo-platform Free-Soilers, he uses such expressions as these. I call the attention of Senators particularly to them, because I shall have occasion to refer to them again presently:

“The party of freedom seeks complete and universal emancipation.” * *

“Slavery is the sin of not some of the States only, but of them all; of not one nation only, but of all nations. It perverted and corrupted the moral sense of mankind deeply and universally, and this corruption became a universal habit. Habits of thought become fixed principles. No American State has yet delivered itself entirely from these habits. We, in New York, are guilty of slavery still by withholding the right of suffrage from the race we have emancipated. You, in Ohio, are guilty in the same way by a system of black laws still more aristocratic and odious. It is written in the Constitution of the United States that five slaves shall count equal to three freemen as a basis of representation; and it is written also, in violation of Divine law, that we shall surrender the fugitive slave who takes refuge at our fireside from his relentless pursuer. You blush not at these things, because they have become as familiar as household words; and your pretended Free-Soil allies claim peculiar merit for maintaining these mis-called guarantees of slavery which they find in the national compact. Does not all this prove that the Whig party have kept up with the spirit of the age? that it is as true and faithful to human freedom as the inert conscience of the American people will permit it to be? What, then, you say, can nothing be done for freedom because the public conscience remains inert? Yes, much can be done, everything can be done. Slavery can be limited to its present bounds. It can be ameliorated. It can be, and must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it. The task is simple and easy, as its consummation will be beneficent and its rewards glorious. It requires only to follow this simple rule of action: To do everywhere and on every occasion what we can, and not to neglect or refuse to do what we can at any time, because at that precise time and on that particular occasion we cannot do more.

“Circumstances determine possibilities.” * * * * *

“But we must begin deeper and lower than the composition and combinations of factions or parties, wherein the strength and security of slavery lie. You answer that it lies in the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions and laws of slaveholding States. Not at all. It is in the erroneous sentiment of the American people. Constitutions and laws can no more rise above the virtue of the people than the limpid stream can climb above the native spring. Inculcate the love of freedom and the equal rights of man under the paternal roof; see to it that they are taught in the schools and in the churches; reform your own code; extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your paternal gods; correct your own error, that slavery has any constitutional guarantee which may not be released, and ought not to be relinquished.”

* * * * *

“Whenever the public mind shall will the abolition of slavery, the way will open for it.

“I know that you will tell me this is all too slow. Well, then, go faster if you can, and I will go with you; but, remember the instructive lesson that was taught in the words, ‘these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the others undone.’”

Such efforts as this were persevered in from time to time. In 1850 he made that speech in which he proclaimed that there was a "higher law" than the Constitution, for which he received the emphatic denunciation of Mr. Clay. His subsequent efforts have been in this same line; and at Rochester more recently he endeavored to render the slaveholders of the South as odious as possible, and declared that there was an "irrepressible conflict" between the free and the slaveholding States. To stimulate the Northern people to attack us, he affirmed that unless they abolished slavery throughout the entire South, we would extend slavery over all the Northern States. In substance, he says, to protect themselves they must destroy our social and political system. When a man says that there is an irrepressible conflict between him and me, and that my head or his must fall, he proclaims himself my *deadliest enemy*. It avails nothing if he even adds that he intends to act quietly and legally, but that my head must fall to save his own. In the present instance, the Senator says that it is for the South to decide whether its system of society shall be destroyed peaceably or by "*violence*." He is benevolent enough to say, that if we will submit, the work shall be done for us quietly and peaceably. By his efforts and those of others, the bulk of the old Whig party was abolitionized, and its members, with the aid of accessions from the Democratic ranks and Abolition societies, have constituted that political organization which to-day threatens the existence of the Republic. It claims for itself the name of Republican party, and by its opponents is designated as the *Black* Republican party. The latter designation is proper to distinguish it from the old Republican party, whose "image and superscription" it seeks to counterfeit; and also because its efforts are entirely directed to advance the black or negro race.

What are the principles of this party, as indicated by its declarations and its acts? It has but a single principle, and that is hostility to negro slavery in the United States. Some of its members have called it a party for human freedom; but this is a mistake; for though there are in the state of slavery in different parts of the world, men of all races, yet it has manifested no sympathy for any but the negro; and even to negro slavery, it seems indifferent outside of the United States. I maintain that it has no principle whatever, but hostility to negro slavery in the United States. A man might be for or against the tariff, the bank, the land distribution, or internal improvements; he might be a Protestant or Catholic, a Christian or infidel; but if he was only actuated by an intense feeling of hostility to negro slavery, or, as that

is interwoven with the social system of the South, if it were only known that he was anxious that the Federal government should exercise all its powers for the destruction of the Southern States, that man would have been accepted as a good member of the Black Republican party.

But while all the members of the party are actuated by this principle or feeling, they differ as to the particular steps or measures to be taken. The most moderate of them say they are merely opposed to the extension of slavery, and, therefore, they are for prohibiting it in the Territories, and opposed to the admission of any other slaveholding States. The Senator from Vermont (Mr. Collamer) said not long since that this was his position, that he was for confining slavery to its present limits, so that in time it might cease to be profitable, and in that way be extinguished. As this position is taken by many men who claim to be moderate and conservative in their views, let us examine it for a few moments. They say that if slavery be confined to its present limits, the slaves will increase in numbers to that extent that slave labor will in time be so abundant that the supply will exceed the demand; and that the owners will, from choice, set them free rather than be at the expense of maintaining them for their labor. Let it be assumed for illustration that it costs ten cents to feed and clothe a slave; then if, owing to the great number of slaves who exist in the Territory, their labor would be worth less than ten cents per day, undoubtedly it would be an advantage for the owners to liberate them. But remember that when the labor of a negro should be worth only ten cents, that of the white man would likewise come down to this price. The result, therefore, is that population is to be crowded in the South to that extent that every laborer is to be reduced to the starving point, as it was in Ireland during the times of the famine. Now, I would ask the Senator from Vermont this question in all candor: if a system was proposed to be instituted by which his constituents were to be reduced to the starving point, and thus crushed, would he counsel them to await such a result? or would he not advise them to **STAND FROM UNDER** before they were destroyed? As there are already four million slaves in the South, when their numbers are increased many times, no one will pretend that they ever would be removed. The plan is to keep the negroes and such whites as are compelled to stay among them down at the starving point for all time. And *this* is the policy of the most moderate and conservative of the Black Republican party.

There are others of them who say, that in addition to this the fugitive slave law must be repealed; slavery abolished in the District of

Columbia, the forts and arsenals, and wherever the United States has exclusive jurisdiction. Others of them contend likewise that the slave trade between the States must be abolished, and also the coastwise trade between the States. Other classes insist, too, that slavery should be attacked in the States themselves. The largest number of the party, however, stand on the same ground of the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward.) He says that slavery has no "constitutional guarantee" which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished; that "circumstances determine possibilities;" that they must stand ready "to do everything when and on every occasion that we can;" and that "whenever the public mind shall will the abolition of slavery, the way will be open for it;" that "it can be and must be abolished, and you and I can and must do it." More recently he said:

"The interest of the white race demands the ultimate emancipation of all men. Whether that consummation shall be allowed to take effect, with needful and wise precautions against sudden change and disaster, or be hurried on by violence; is all that remains for you to decide."

He also declares that he will go with those who can show him the fastest road to effect the object. Such is the governing principle and spirit of the party, to use all the power they have, or can by any possibility acquire, for the abolition of slavery.

When we look to the acts of this party, in what attitude is it presented? It has made the whole newspaper press subject to its control intensely hostile to the Southern section of the Union. Such is the power of the public press that it was able to keep England and France for centuries in a state of hatred and war with each other. Only a few weeks since, to prevent a collision between the two countries, the Emperor of France publicly checked the press of his own country; and yet the fiercest articles in the French journals were moderate in comparison with the general tone of the anti-slavery press towards the South.

This party, too, sends up representatives to the two Houses of Congress from time to time, who, neglecting all the public business of the country, devote themselves to preparing and reciting denunciatory harangues against the Southern States. Some years ago, an intelligent foreigner, who happened to hear one of these tirades in this body, expressed his astonishment at the quiet manner in which it was listened to by southern Senators. He declared that if, when a European congress had met for business purposes, a similar course had been taken, the congress would at once have been broken up. In our State

Legislatures, such things, if they occur, are soon stopped by personal collisions. In Congress, out of deference to sectional feelings, there is no attempt to check such men as choose to embark in the trade of heaping all manner of obloquy on our constituents.

This anti-slavery party has torn to pieces most of the great Christian associations of the country ; in spite of all the resistance which the *esprit du corps* and Christian charity prevailing among them could present. It has stricken down every public man in the North within its reach who has shown a willingness to administer the Constitution fairly in relation to slavery.

Whenever it has obtained the control of the Legislatures, it has caused them to pass the most stringent acts for the nullification of that clause of the Constitution which provides for the return of fugitive slaves. When many years ago the State of South Carolina threatened to nullify a law of Congress, the whole Union was thrown into a state of the greatest excitement ; but so common have these proceedings become in the free States, that they now scarcely excite a remark when passed.

This party, too, has organized societies, and hired agents to steal and carry away slaves from the Southern States ; and when a gang of twenty or more is taken off at a time, it is made a matter of public rejoicing ; and their papers boast of the perfection of the *underground* railroads, and of the millions of dollars' worth of property that they have taken from the South.

The Federal system, instead of giving us protection, only affords our enemies immunities and facilities for attack. Instead of being a shield, the Union has been converted into a sword to stab us the more deeply.

It is idle for Senators to say that a majority of the people in their States are not in favor of these unlawful proceedings. If only one man out of every hundred should be a thief, and the other ninety-nine should not restrain them, by legislation or otherwise, this minority of thieves would be able to steal all the property in the community. If societies were formed in Massachusetts to steal property in Connecticut or New York, the Legislature and people of the State would doubtless take steps to restrain them. This is done even with reference to foreign countries, to prevent war between them. American citizens are punished for going in to Canada to disturb that British community.

If societies were formed in Canada for a similar purpose, and were, in fact, to steal an equal amount of property from New England, New

York, Ohio, and other Northern States, to what is carried away by the Abolitionists from the South, we should be involved in a war with Great Britain in less than six months. What would be the feeling of those border States, if Canadian orators should boast that their societies had robbed them of \$45,000,000 worth of their property, just as they now say they hold that value of Southern runaway slaves? But men who combine to plunder the people of the Southern States, so far from being punished, are, in many of the free States, encouraged by the legislation there.

During the last session, the Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) introduced a proposition for additional legislation to prevent the foreign or African slave trade to the United States. In 1808, Congress passed laws to prohibit that trade, and since that time, a period of more than fifty years, as far as I know or have reason to believe, the law has been violated but in a single instance. What other law on your statute-book has been so well kept? I repeat, what law has Congress ever passed, which there was a temptation to violate, that has been so well observed? That it was not broken often, is not owing to any want of opportunity. Northern, as well as foreign ships, have been engaged in the trade, and the extent of the Southern coast affords much greater facilities for the introduction of slaves than does the Island of Cuba, into which large numbers are annually carried. This law has not been broken, simply because the people of the South were not *willing to violate it*. Now, sir, let me state a case for the consideration of the Senate. Suppose, instead of what has actually occurred, the State of Georgia, where some negroes were landed, and a number of other Southern States, had passed the strongest laws which could be devised to defeat the act of Congress forbidding the African slave trade, and encouraging that traffic by all the means in their power; suppose, further, that Southern Senators, and other prominent public men, had, in their speeches, earnestly recommended the violation of the law of Congress, and that all through the South money was subscribed and associations formed to defeat the law, and provide facilities by railroad or otherwise for the introduction of Africans, and mobs were gotten up to overpower the United States marshals, could not a hundred negroes have been imported for every one that the Abolitionists have stolen? Yes, with a shore-line of more than ten thousand miles, millions might have been imported.

This proceeding would have been a violation of the laws of the United States, just like that which has occurred with reference to the

fugitive slave law. In the case supposed, however, the southern men would have had greatly the advantage on the score both of political economy and morality. They might have said, with truth, that the negroes imported from Africa added to the production and wealth of the United States, while those carried North by the Abolitionists were generally converted into idle vagrants. It might also have been said that African savages were, by being brought to the United States, partially civilized, and not only made more intelligent and moral, but also christianized in large numbers; while the negroes carried to the North become so worthless and so vicious, that many of the States there were seeking to exclude them by legislation, as communities do the plague and other contagious disorders. And the Senator from New York, who has declared that it is a religious duty of the people of the North to violate the fugitive slave law, and urged them, instead of delivering up the runaway negroes, to protect and defend them as they do their paternal gods, stands up in the face of the American Senate and complains of violation of the laws against the African slave-trade! Was there ever such an exhibition? I repeat, was the like ever seen since the creation of the world? I may use strong language, but truth demands it. That Senator, too, has fully indorsed the incendiary and revolutionary doctrines of the Helper book, as a large majority of the members of his party in the House have done.

Such, then, Mr. President, are the views of this party, as indicated alike by its declarations and its acts. Its members are moving on with an accelerated velocity. While the more moderate of them now occupy the ground of the Abolitionists twenty years ago, most of them are far in advance of that position. Ought we to stand still until all the States are as thoroughly abolitionized as Massachusetts now is? If not, what can be done to arrest the mischief? I propose, then, seriously, to consider this question.

In my judgment there are two modes in which it can and ought to be met. The first is under the Constitution; the second may be outside of it.

If abolitionism be a popular delusion, can it not be dispelled by proper efforts? Truth can overcome error; but to enable it to do so it must be properly presented to the human mind. As the anti-slavery party have acquired their present ascendancy by vigorous and widely extended efforts, if they are to be overthrown, it is only by decided and persevering exertions on the other side. There are, in my opinion, sufficient conservative elements in the free States for this purpose, if

they can only be properly arrayed in opposition. It is necessary that the discussion should be widely extended and also directed to the merits of the question involved. The constitutional argument is sufficient for the intelligent and honest; but if it be said, for example merely, that slavery, as existing in the Southern States, is a great wrong and great evil, yet that under the Constitution the people of the North have no right to interfere with it, the party so defending will in the end lose ground; because masses of men, when excited by real or imaginary wrongs, will in time break over mere legal restraints which they regard as unjust and criminal. They hold that "where there is a will there is a way," and will find some mode of action. But in this case the real issue is, whether or not the negro is the equal of the white man physically, intellectually, and morally? Though usually evaded in the discussion, this is the real question which lies at the foundation of the controversy. If the people of the Northern States should regard the negro as being the equal of the white man, then they will continue to feel a sympathy for him in slavery, and can be excited to efforts for his liberation. If, on the contrary, he be different in material respects from the white man, and also inferior, then his case must be decided on its own merits and not from any supposed analogy to that of the white man. It is not, as the Abolitionists in their silliness assert, a mere question of color or prejudice against a black skin. If the negro were, in fact, in all other respects like the white man, his blackness would have been of no more consequence than the difference between black and red hair or light and dark eyes. The feeling against him grows out of the fact that he is in all respects different from the white man and inferior. When I put the question to any one that I may meet here, the chances are that he will at once agree with me in private conversation, and admit, in the language used sometime ago by the Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Trumbull) that Omnipotence has made a difference between the white man and the negro; and yet it is this very opposite view in favor of negro equality which gives its main force and vitality to the anti-slavery movement. When, sir, some twelve years ago, I, in discussion, threw out suggestions about the difference of races, I was denounced as one who attributed injustice to God Almighty in alleging that He had made the negroes inferior. Will any Senator on the other side of this chamber tell me why it is that Providence brings half the children that are born in New England into the world with constitutions so feeble that they cannot live until they are twenty-one years of age?

Or will they, upon their views of His justice, explain why it is that, in the same family, one brother is provided with a good constitution and strong intellect, while a second has, from his birth, the seeds of debility and incurable disease, and a third is mentally imbecile or perhaps idiotic? Would the injustice to the feeble be greater if they were black men? Are we to refuse to believe the facts which nature constantly presents to us, because they do not harmonize with our ideas of the justice of the Creator? The Bible itself does not explain to us why it is that, while ten talents are given to one man, to another but a single talent is given. For the inequality of the negro, Providence is responsible, as He is for the entire creation which surrounds us. When human laws are in accordance with the system of nature, they are wise; but if in opposition to it, they are productive only of mischief. The question is significantly asked in the Scriptures, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" The ancients expressed their opinions on this subject in the fable which represented a black man as having been killed in an effort to wash him white.

There is no middle ground which can be maintained on this question. If the negro be your equal, why do you exclude him from your parlors? If he be unequal, your whole argument has in fact lost its foundation and fails. If it once be admitted that the negro is inferior, then the entire edifice of Abolitionism falls to the ground, because it is intimately interwoven with, and owes its vitality to the opposite belief. When pressed boldly on this issue, the Abolitionists of late are trying to evade it. It is a singular and striking fact, that when this issue has been made in the free States directly, and discussed before the people, they have decided the point against the negro. Such was the case in Connecticut and New York on the question of suffrage, and also in the States of Illinois and Indiana on the proposition to exclude free negroes from those States. In the contest, too, in Illinois, in the year 1858, which resulted in the triumph of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas) this was the leading issue. Had that Senator contented himself with simply saying that slavery was an evil which his constituents had no constitutional right to interfere with, I do not believe he would have been successful. But he understood the question, went at once into the merits of it, and carried the war into the enemy's ranks. And his opponent early in the contest began to cower and shrink from his blows, and tried in vain to evade the issue. The American people understand the negro, and where a direct appeal is made to them they truly respond. Though the story of Dean Swift, in

which, in a certain country, he represents the horse as being greatly superior to the man, is an ingenious one, yet it misleads nobody among us, because horses are so common that their qualities are understood. So the romances of the Abolitionists, in which they represent the negro as being equal and even superior to the white man, deceive no one familiar with the negro. In southern Ohio, for example, where free negroes are quite common, there is little or no Abolitionism; while in the northern part, in which the negro is seldom seen, anti-slavery carries everything before it. European writers know little or nothing of the negro, and hence our professors, preachers, and other mere book-men of the North, are easily led astray by European and American Abolitionists; but the people of the country, who are accustomed to look at facts, are not so readily imposed on. A thorough investigation of the subject shows the negro to be inferior, and hence the principles which apply to white men cannot be extended to him. No farmer assumes that what is advantageous to the hog, for example, is necessarily so to the sheep. To determine, therefore, what is to be done with the negro, you must study the negro himself. Remember, I do not undertake to decide how or when the negro race became different from the white. They may, as many men of science contend, have been created of different species, or they may have been rendered different since their creation, by an act of Providence. Some plausibly say, that inasmuch as we learn from the Scriptures that a certain race were condemned to be slaves through all time, the negro best fulfills this description, and hence take him as the representative of that class. Without attempting to decide who is right as to theory, I think it clear that the difference between the white race and the negro is as great as that between certain different species of animals of the same genus, that approximate each other in their structure and habits. But it is said: Do you deny the manhood of the negro? No more than I should deny the *monkeyhood* of an ape if I should say he is not a baboon, or the *duckship* of a mallard if I deny that he is a canvas-back duck.

Instead of indulging in vague generalities about human liberty and the rights of man, examine the nature and condition of the negro himself. Four thousand years ago, in the climate best suited to his constitution, he was a savage and a slave. In his own country he stands in the same category with ivory, dates, and other tropical productions. If transferred, as merchandise, to a foreigner, he is usually benefited by escaping from a master who will eat him in times of scarcity to one who treats him with more lenity and often with kindness. Egypt was

the seat of the earliest civilization known to man, and the Egyptians held the negro as a slave, but were not able to civilize his race; though subsequently in contact with the Carthagenians, Romans and Saracens, he still remained a savage and a slave.

In the West Indies, and in other portions of America where they form independent communities, notwithstanding the advantages they had from the teachings of the white men, and their great powers of imitation, they seem to be returning to their original savage state. When we turn to the free negroes of the United States, what shall I say of them? Why, Northern as well as Southern men, and even Canadians, characterize them as the most worthless of the human race. Formerly the Abolitionists ascribed their degradation to the want of political and social privileges. But during the middle ages, in Europe, the Jews were not only without political privileges, but were, as a class, odious and severely persecuted, yet they were, nevertheless, intelligent, energetic and wealthy. In point of fact, in some portions of the Northern States, the negro has been made a pet of, and but for his native inferiority, must have thriven and even become distinguished. On the other hand, it is an indisputable fact that the four million negroes who are held in slavery in the South, when their condition is considered with reference to their physical well-being and comfort, their productiveness as laborers, their intelligence, morality and religion, stand superior to any other portion of their race. While the free negroes in the North, with fresh accessions from abroad, diminish in numbers, the slaves of the South increase as rapidly as the white race, and, upon the whole, perhaps, adds a much to the wealth of the country in which they are located as any equal number of laborers in the world.

What the Abolitionists have to do is to find, or create, a negro community which is superior to that of the slaves of the South. When they shall have done this, they will have laid some grounds for their appeals in behalf of emancipation. Hitherto they have enlisted the sympathies and feelings of the North by falsely assuming that the negro and white man have in all respects the same nature. Let the inequality which the Creator has made be recognised, and their system falls to the ground.

But the Abolitionists sometimes say that, even if it be true that the negro is inferior, for that reason, namely, on account of his weakness, he ought not to be enslaved. Does this reasoning apply to children? The average of human life is less than forty years, and how can you justify depriving human beings of liberty for more than half that time?

If children were the equals of adults, it would be wrong to control them. It is simply because they are inferior that we justify their subjection to the will of others. Upon these principles the negro, being, as compared with the white man, always a child, is benefited by the control to which he is subjected.

When pressed on those points by an array of facts, the Abolitionists fall back on the opinions of Mr. Jefferson and others of the last century. But since their day the sciences have made a prodigious advance, and in all that relates to the peculiarities and distinctions that exist between the different races of men, there has been the greatest progress of any. In fact, it is a science which has almost grown up in our day, and it has made such strides as to have taken possession of the intellect of America. Already there are hundreds who have adopted the doctrine to one who believed it ten years ago. It is only necessary for the true men to take it up boldly, and press it home, and the Abolitionists can be routed throughout the North.

The shrewder anti-slavery men, however, seeing that they cannot make longer a successful fight for the negro, affirm that their objection to slavery is not on this account, but for the sake of the white men, and that they and the South are injured by the institution, and that our people are for that reason wanting in enterprise and industry. To that argument I have this to say in reply. Where, Mr. President, in all history was it known that one nation was so strongly under the influence of benevolence, as to cause it to make war upon another merely to compel the nation attacked to become more enterprising and prosperous? Who has invaded Spain or Turkey to compel the Spaniards or Turks to become more industrious and thrifty? Will any one gravely pretend that this torrent of fanaticism in the North has no other origin except a desire to compel the people of the South to be more industrious, and to take better care of their own interests, and be more attentive to their own business? The idea is preposterous. I have no doubt but that misrepresentations on these points have contributed to strengthen the anti-slavery party. But, sir, is there any difficulty in making a complete defence on this point? With no wish, Mr. President, to wound the sensibilities of any one, or to claim superiority for my section, let us, nevertheless, look at some of the principal facts. One of the best tests of the prosperity of a country and its healthy condition is the progress of its population. Compare the population of the fifteen slaveholding States with that of all the free States as shown by the census of 1840 and 1850, the last decade

ascertained. If we deduct from both sections the foreign emigrant population, which is an accidental increment, it will be found that the slaveholding States have increased much faster in population than the free States.

Again, sir, a fair estimate of the wealth of the two sections will show that the citizens of the Southern States are as rich per head, I think in fact richer, than those of the free States. It was also shown by Mr. Branch, a colleague of mine, some two years ago, that of the old Atlantic States the slaveholding had more miles of railroad in proportion to their white population than the free States. There are other evidences of our material wealth, to which I will presently advert. On the score of morals, it may be said that we have fewer criminals and paupers, and, proportionately, church accommodations for a larger number of members.

It is said, however, that any one who merely looks at the two sections will see the inferiority of the Southern system. But you must remember that our population is extended over a territory of nine hundred thousand miles in extent, while many of the Northern States have a dense population. It is the tendency of an agricultural people, with an unlimited area, to extend itself rapidly at first, while commerce and manufactures concentrate population. Tried by this standard, any one of a dozen monarchies which I passed through, during the past summer, has the advantage of any portion of the Union. Even Italy, oppressed as it has been for ages, in its agricultural landscape, can bring to shame the best cultivated State of New England. According to the logic of the Abolitionists, these States ought to be placed under the dominion of the House of Austria or the Pope of Rome. The entire State of Massachusetts is not larger than one of the Congressional districts of North Carolina. Where a million of people are brought within a small area, the eye of the observer rests on many habitations and fields. In time, the whole Union, if filled with people, may be superior to the best cultivated parts of Europe; but even now, the inhabitants of sparsely-settled districts have as much wealth and comfort, all things being considered, as those who live in crowded communities. At no period of our history have the Southern States been more prosperous than at present, and even were during the commercial pressure of 1857, which has so seriously affected the Northern States.

I do not, however, propose, Mr. President, to enter into a general argument on these topics, but to maintain that the conservative men

of the North have within their reach facts enough to establish two propositions. The first is, that the negro, in the condition of slavery, is not a proper object for sympathy, and is, in fact, benefited by his subjection. The second one is, that the white race are not injured by the institution; that the Southern States constitute, in the aggregate, a prosperous community, and ought not to be the subject of denunciation at the North. Should this be made to appear, then, whatever of real feeling exists against us will be diminished, and, in that event, we may expect that persons who, like the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward) patronize abolition from such motives as induce a jockey on a race-course to back the horse that he thinks likely to win—all such persons, I say, will find it expedient to abandon anti-slavery agitation as a trade. To effect such results, however, the friends of the Constitution in the North must make up their minds to undergo the labor of a thorough canvass of their region against the anti-slavery men, and by proper publications refute their misrepresentations.

The Abolitionists declaim constantly against the *slave power*. Why, sir, it is sixteen years since there was any attempt by the Democratic party to nominate a citizen of the slaveholding States for the office of President; and for the last ten years, in the conventions of all parties, the contest has been solely among Northern men. In fact, during that period no electoral vote has been given in a slaveholding State, for the office of President, to any Southern man. Our only object has been to select among Northern gentlemen one who was not our *enemy*. The men chosen have been assailed by our opponents, not because they were neglectful of any Northern interest, but simply because they were willing to do us equal justice with the other section, and refused to exercise the powers of the common government against us.

It has been urged that the Southern States should, by retaliatory legislation, prohibit the sale within their limits, of the productions of those of the Northern States that have failed to do us justice. As the Constitution of the United States has been interpreted, both by the Federal and State courts, there is ample power to effect this by imposing a tax on articles after they have been imported and the packages broken; in other words, on retailers. Two objects are expected to be effected by this system. In the first place, to make it the interest of the Northern States to counteract the efforts of the Abolitionists; and secondly, to prepare the Southern States for a separation, if they should find it necessary to take such a step.

I have often thought, Mr. President, that it was unfortunate that the framers of the Constitution made no provision for the expulsion of a State. If the Union be a place of misery, then, to punish refractory members, they should undoubtedly be kept in it, as criminals are detained in penitentiaries; but if, on the other hand, it be a beneficial and desirable thing to remain in the Union, then bad members ought to be excluded from it. No State, in my judgment, has a right to enjoy the advantages of the Union, and yet refuse to submit to the obligations it imposes. Such laws of Congress as are held by the courts to be constitutional ought to be obeyed by all the States that share the advantages of the Union. If, for example, when a dozen years ago the State of Massachusetts passed laws to nullify the act for the recovery of fugitives, if she had been expelled from the Union, two striking effects would have been produced. In the first place, the consciences of the inhabitants of that State would have been freed from all responsibility for the sin and turpitude of slavery; and, secondly, their goods, when brought into the United States, would have been taxed as those of other foreigners are. The impression which such an occurrence would have made on their minds and those of the country generally, might possibly then have arrested the anti-slavery movement when it was comparatively feeble. In the present condition of things, such a course would not be practicable, perhaps.

If, however, Mr President, this hostile movement of the anti-slavery party cannot be arrested under the Constitution, let us consider the second remedy, namely, a temporary or permanent separation of the Southern from the Northern States.

Senators on the other side of the Chamber do not think this will occur. When Giddings and others proclaim that "the South cannot be kicked out of the Union," such a declaration is received by the anti-slavery party of the country with evident satisfaction, and generally with applause. You, Senators and your supporters do not believe there is danger in any event, because prominent slaveholders and men of wealth occasionally tell you they are conservative, and that the Southern people will submit to any treatment you may think fit to impose. But you should remember that these persons are not always the readiest to volunteer to defend the country in time of war, and that many of them dread civil commotions. During our revolution there were wealthy Tories in every one of the colonies; and at the time General Washington evacuated the city of New York, he was urged by one of his subordinate officers, a Northern man, to burn the city, for

the reason that two-thirds of the property to be destroyed belonged to Tories.

You do not believe, also, because you say that if the South were in earnest, it would be more united, and would not send up as she does from certain districts, members of Congress who assist you in party movements, and in answer to your threats proclaim their love of the Union.

You should understand, however, that the constituencies of such member are merely misled as to the purposes, principles and power of your party by those newspapers on which they rely for information, Let them have proper knowledge as to the condition of the country where your influence prevails, and they will manifest the same feeling that the rest of the South does. Gradually a knowledge of your movements and objects is spreading over the Southern States. Two occurrences have materially contributed to unmask your objects and disclose the dangers which threaten. The first was the vote which Mr. Fillmore received in 1856. When it was seen that a man like him, of avowed anti-slavery opinions, merely because he showed his willingness to enforce the fugitive slave law, and declared his purpose to give to the South the benefits of the Constitution, was beaten largely in every free State, by a mere adventurer like Fremont, a great impression was made on the conservative men of the South. They began to realize the state of feeling in the North, and more disunionists were made by that occurrence than perhaps any one which proceeded it.

The second incident which caused even a much stronger impression on the minds of the Southern people, was the manner in which the acts of John Brown were received in the North. Instead of the indignation and abhorrence which the atrociousness of his crimes ought naturally to have excited, there were manifestations of admiration and sympathy. Large meetings were held to express these feelings, sermons and prayers were made in his behalf, church bells tolled and cannon fired, and more significant than all these, were the declarations of almost the entire Republican press, that his punishment would strengthen the anti-slavery cause. Yet Senators tell us that these things were done because of the courage Brown exhibited. But our people think you are mistaken. Though the mere thief may be, and usually is, a coward, yet it is well known that men who engage in robbery or piracy, as a profession, generally possess courage. Criminals have been executed frequently in New England who, both in the commission of their crimes and in their death, manifested as much courage as John Brown, and

yet none of them called forth such feelings of sympathy. At a meeting in Boston, where thousands were assembled, when Emerson, a literary man of eminence, proclaimed that Brown had made "the gallows as glorious as the cross," he was rapturously applauded. At the large meeting at Natick, where the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Wilson) was a spectator, the principal orator, Wright, declared that the people of the North look upon "Jesus Christ as a *dead failure*," and hereafter will rely on "John Brown, and him hanged."

In the Southern States where old-fashioned Christian notions still prevail, it would be thought right to beat such blasphemers even out of a church, if they had congregated there. We are told now that they were not interrupted because the people of Massachusetts are *law-abiding*, and in favor of the *liberty of speech*. But our constituents do not believe one word of this, because they know that of all the people in the Union, the inhabitants of Massachusetts are the most excitable and the most intolerant and overbearing. They know that men who dare to oppose the anti-slavery party there are persecuted with intense hatred; that mobs can be gotten up on the smallest occasions, and that ten thousand men can be assembled on the shortest notice to rescue a runaway negro from the custody of a United States Marshal.

Our people know that these things could not have occurred unless there had been an intense feeling of hostility to the South, and, therefore, strong sympathy with our assailants. Is not this the reason why your leading editors have declared that the punishment of John Brown will strengthen the anti-slavery cause? Such is the construction the people of the South put on this whole matter, and hence the demonstrations you witness among them.

But you hold that the South is unable and unwilling to resist you; and the Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) has declared, in substance, that the Union is never to be dissolved. He also told the Senate that the contest between the free and slaveholding States had ended by the former winning the victory. He and the rest of you expect us in the future to submit quietly to what you may see fit to order. Had the British Parliament believed that the colonies would resist their tax bills our Revolution would not have occurred; but Lord North and others declared that the clamor in America came from a few seditious agitators, and that the great body of the people were so loyal to the government that they were ready to submit to the action of the Parliament. They affirmed that there was no danger of resistance; and, least of all, of their thinking of dissolving the union

with the mother country. Our ancestors wisely determined that the cannon of Great Britain were less dangerous than her acts of Parliament.

Let us look at this matter for a few moments calmly. At this time the population of the South is nearly thirteen million, of which more than eight million are free persons and four million slaves. At the beginning of our Revolution the population of the colonies, both free, and slave, was less than three million. The slaveholding States are then far more than four times as strong as were the colonies when they dissolved the union with Great Britain.

Is it likely that after having been independent for eighty years, our people are less attached to their rights? But many of your Abolitionists say that slaveholding has enfeebled our people, and rendered them so spiritless that they are neither willing nor able to make defence. Edmund Burke thought differently, and said that of all men, slaveholders were the most tenacious of their rights, and defended their liberties with the highest and haughtiest spirit. I do not refer to the war of the Revolution, when all the States were slaveholding; but in the last war with Great Britain, the Southern States sent out more men than the Northern, and it has never yet, as far as I have heard, been pretended that Harrison and Johnson, Scott and Forsyth, were not as brave as those who went from the free States to the Canada line, or that Jackson and the men under him in the Southwest, did not exhibit a proper courage. To the war with Mexico, though much the less populous section, the South sent nearly twice as many men as the North. A leading Black Republican editor says that one regiment from New York would be able to conquer all the Southern States. A regiment from the State of New York certainly conducted itself well during the Mexican war; but it has not, I think, been affirmed that it behaved better than the regiments from the slaveholding States. If you, therefore, think that one of your regiments is able to subdue the South, our people will probably differ with you in opinion. You say that fear of the slaves will prevent any resistance to you. As a sudden movement of a few negroes, stimulated by abolition emissaries, might destroy a family or two, there is undoubtedly apprehension felt. Fifty persons, however, are killed in this country by vicious and unmanageable horses, to one who suffers from the act of a rebellious negro. There is, in fact, about as much reason to apprehend a general insurrection of the horses as of the slaves of the South when left to themselves. When, during the war of 1812, the British armies were

in the slaveholding territory, though they induced a number of slaves to join them, they found no advantage to result from it, and their government paid for all carried off at the close of the war. Though the Spartans and Romans were the greatest slaveholders in the world, and though, too, they held in the most rigid servitude men of their own color and race, and therefore liable to rebel in great force, yet they were strong enough to overthrow all their enemies. In our opinion, the slaves are a positive element of strength, because they add to the production of the country, while the white race can furnish soldiers enough. Every man, too, among us, is accustomed to ride and to carry weapons from his childhood.

There are, however, other important elements to be taken into the account. During the last fiscal year the exports of the United States, exclusive of specie, were \$278,000,000. Of this amount, the free States furnished, exclusively, \$5,281,000, the slave States \$188,000,000, and the two sections jointly, also, \$84,417,000. Of this latter sum of \$84,000,000, the slave States probably furnished one-third, but certainly one-fourth. A fourth added to the amount exclusively furnished by them, makes a total of \$210,000,000 as the value of their exports to foreign countries. They also exported a large amount to the free States. New England alone received about fifty million dollars' worth of Southern productions; and to the rest of the free States were sent, doubtless, more. The entire exports from the slaveholding States to the free States, and to foreign countries combined, must greatly have exceeded three hundred million dollars. As the South sells this much, it, of course, can afford to buy a like amount. If, therefore, it constituted a separate confederacy, its imports would exceed three hundred million dollars; a duty of twenty per cent. on this amount, which would be a lower rate than has generally been paid under our tariffs heretofore, would yield a revenue of \$60,000,000. More than fifty million of this sum could well be spared for the defence of our section, and the support of larger armies and navies than the present government has. Though it may seem strange to you that the South should in this way raise as large a revenue as the whole Union has ever done, and this too, with a lower tariff, you must remember that most of the tariff taxes the South pays go, in fact, in the shape of protection to those Northern manufacturers who threaten us with negro insurrection and subjugation. Do you think that with these prospects before our people they are ready to submit unconditionally to you? They have the strongest feelings of contempt for

the avaricious and greedy, the canting and hypocritical, the mean, envious, and malicious Abolitionists. Little as they may think of the free negro, he is, in their judgment, more respectable than the white man who comes down to his level; and with all the world to choose a master from, your negro worshiper would be their last choice.

In making up our calculations, we must also look to the other side. The free States have a population of seventeen or eighteen millions. Though this is considerably more, numerically, than our strength, yet it is much less, relatively, than was the population of Great Britain in 1776. I have no doubt that your people are courageous, generally; but the best and bravest of them are in the Democratic ranks; and, while they would defend their section, if attacked, I doubt if they would easily be induced to assail us. Many of your Abolitionists belong to the "*peace party*," and have little appetite for cold steel, though they are the most efficient in getting up popular clamors, and are formidable at the ballot-box. It is also true, that while everything the South needs she can either produce or commonly get cheaper in Europe, under a system of free trade, your Northeastern States are especially dependent on the South for its productions and freights. How many of your manufacturers and mechanics would emigrate to the South to avoid the payment of tariff taxes? If it were known that one-third of the stores in New York could not be rented, how much would real property fall, then? Deprived of Southern freights, what would be the loss on your vast shipping interest? I give you, in this calculation, the benefit of the assumption that all the free States would go with you. In fact, I do not believe that the Northwest would remain connected with New England, still less that you could retain California and Oregon.

But you, Senators, do not believe the South will resist. Look for a moment at the course of things there. In those sections that I am best acquainted with, there are hundreds of disunionists now where there was one ten years ago. By disunionists, I mean men who would prefer to see the Union continue, if the Constitution were fairly administered, but who have already deliberately come to the conclusion that this is impossible, and would willingly to-day see the Union dissolved. In some of the States, this class constitutes decided majorities now, and in others where they are not, the majority is ready to unite with them upon the happening of some further causes. In my judgment, the election of the presidential candidate of the Black Republican party will furnish that cause. The principles of that party, as announced

in the contest of 1856, were such that no honorable Southern man could possibly belong to it. I see that the general committee, in their call, properly take this view, and only extend their invitation to the opposition in the free States. What precise anti-slavery platform they adopt is not very important, as they will of course make it so as to obtain the support of their most moderate members, knowing that the ultra ones will go with them anyhow. In fact they know that, in the language of the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward) "circumstances determine possibilities," and that he and they are willing "at all times" to do all they can, in power or out of it, to overthrow slavery.

It is said, however, that we ought to wait for some overt act; and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) the other day declared that it was wrong and insolent for Southern men to talk of resisting merely because they, the Republicans, elected men to carry out "*their views!*" That Senator is very wise, and knows that when a man wishes to subdue a wild horse, he treats the animal with the greatest kindness at first, and commits no *overt act* on him until he is *well and securely tied*. Suppose that your candidate was known to be in favor of making a treaty with Great Britain, by which the United States were to be reannexed as colonies to that country, and he had been elected by the majority of votes, would the minority, who might still wish to preserve their independence, be bound to wait until the treaty had been actually ratified, and British armies had taken possession of the country, and began to maltreat the inhabitants? In the present case, the very inauguration of your candidate makes him commander of the army and navy. One of his first acts would be, doubtless, to station them advantageously, while, at the same time, he could carefully remove from the South all the public arms, lest the people should take them for defence. He would fill the Southern States with post-masters and other officials, whose efforts would be directed to dividing, as much as possible, the people of the South, and to forming connections with the negroes. Doubtless, some such policy as this would be adopted before any direct blow was struck at slavery anywhere. Should we, under these disadvantages, begin to resist, a long and bloody struggle, like that of our Revolution, might be the consequence. The very impression that Fremont was to be elected produced some disturbances among the slaves; and with a Black Republican President a hundred such forays as John Brown's might occur in a single year. Though the negroes left to themselves are harmless, yet when assisted and led on by Europeans in St. Domingo, they destroyed the

white inhabitants. As the Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) holds that the constitutional guarantees in favor of slavery, being "in violation of the divine law, cannot be enforced, and "ought to be relinquished," he would be on the side of the negro.

The objections are not personal merely to this Senator, but apply equally to any member of the party elected by it. It has, in fact, been suggested that, as a matter of prudence, for the first election they should choose a Southern Free-Soiler. Would the colonies have submitted more willingly to Benedict Arnold than to Lord Cornwallis? By way of palliation it has been said, that even if a Black Republican should be elected, he would probably disappoint his party, and be more conservative than they are; and that the worst he would do, might be to plunder the country, by legislation or otherwise. This, however, would be only a reprieve to us; for the very fact of his election on such grounds, and our submission, as it would destroy our friends in the North, would demoralize and degrade our own people and render them incapable of resistance, while our enemies flushed with success, would select afterwards, more ultra agents to carry out their "views." No other "*overt act*" can so imperatively demand resistance on our part, as the simple election of their candidate. Their organization is one of avowed hostility, and they come against us as *enemies*; and should we submit we shall be in the condition of an army which surrenders at discretion, and can only expect such terms as the humanity of the conqueror may grant.

But, we are asked how we will go about making a revolution or dissolving the Union? This would possibly have been a difficult question to answer during the first year of our Revolution, when our forefathers were avowedly fighting to get good terms of reconciliation with the mother country. Mr. Jefferson said that six weeks before the Declaration was made, a majority of the men who made it had not even thought of independence. The people of the colonies, though they had not authorized anybody to make it, accepted it, nevertheless, as a fact.

Who anticipated the sudden revolutions that overthrew several monarchies in France? Though it requires skill to create governments, yet men often destroy them very unscientifically. As the main strength of all governments is in public opinion, so, when that is forfeited, they often seem to fall easily and suddenly. As the government of the United States, with the attachment of its citizens, is

the strongest in the world, so, when that is lost, it would become one of the weakest.

I may say, however, that I do not think there will be any secession of the Southern members of Congress from this Capitol. It has always struck me that this is a point not to be voluntarily surrendered to the public enemy. If lives should be lost here, it would seem poetically just that this should occur. I cannot find words enough to express my abhorrence and detestation of such creatures as Garrison and Wendell Phillips, who stimulate others to deeds of blood, and, at the same time, are so cowardly that they avoid all danger themselves. As from this Capitol so much has gone forth to inflame the public mind, if our countrymen are to be involved in a bloody struggle, I trust in God that the first fruits of the collision may be reaped here. While it is due to justice that I should speak thus, it is but fair to myself to say, that I do not remember a time when I would have been willing to sacrifice the life of an innocent person to save my own; and I have never doubted but that it was the duty of every citizen to give his life cheerfully to preserve the union of these States, while that Union was founded on an honest observance of the Constitution. Of the benefits of this Confederacy to all sections, provided justice be done in the administration of the government, there can be no question.

Independently of its advantages to us all, there are reasons why it should be maintained. Considerations of this kind were, during the last year, brought to my mind from new points of view, and with added force. When, last spring, I landed in England, I found that country agitated with questions of reform. In the struggle which was maintained on both sides with the greatest animation, there were constant references to the United States; and the force of our example was stimulating the Liberals, and tending to the overthrow of aristocratic and monarchic restrictions. Our institutions and our opinions were referred to only to be applauded, except by a small but influential aristocratic clique. That oligarchy cannot forget the Revolution of July, 1776, which deprived Britain of this magnificent western empire; and it sees, with even bitterer feelings, its own waning power and vanishing privileges under the inspiring influences of our prosperity. It, however, is always ready to take by the hand any American of prominent position who habitually denounces and depreciates his own government, and labors for its overthrow.

In this connection, I remember a statement made to me by the late American Minister at Paris, Mr. Mason. He spoke of having had a

conversation with one, whose name I do not feel at liberty to mention, but whose influence on the opinion of continental Europe is considerable, who admitted to him that there was nothing in fact wrong in our negro slavery; but who, nevertheless, declared that if the Union of our States continued, at no distant day we should control the world; and, therefore, as an European, he felt it to be his duty to press anti-slavery views, as the only chance to divide us. I have other and many reasons to know that the monarchies of Europe, threatened with downfall from revolutionary movements, seek, through such channels as they control, to make similar impressions. A hundred times was the question asked me, "Will you divide in America?" But never once was the inquiry made of me, "Will slavery be abolished, will your country become more respectable in the eyes of the Abolitionists?" The middle and lower classes of England, who are struggling to acquire additional privileges, look with satisfaction and hope to our progress. France, too, is imbued with American ideas, and, notwithstanding its despotic form of government, is one of the most democratic countries in Europe. Italy I found in the midst of revolutions, and its monarchies falling down without even a day's notice, and its inhabitants, while recalling the republican ideas of past ages, looked with exultation to that great trans-Atlantic Confederacy, where there are no kings and no dukes; and more than once, while passing through Tuscany or Lombardy, the enthusiasm of the people reminded me, by their music and banners and shoutings, of my own countrymen, at a Fourth of July celebration. Germany, the receptacle of millions of letters from this side of the water, is being rapidly educated and is already far advanced to a stable free system. The Swiss and the Belgians are boasting of the resemblances of their governments and ours. Everywhere, too, are our countrymen distinguished and recognized for their intellectual activity and energy. The people abroad have, perhaps, exaggerated ideas of our immense progress, our vast power, and growing ascendancy in the civilized world. The masses, pressed down by military conscriptions and inordinate taxation, look with pride and confidence to the great American Republic, that in time they hope will dominate over the earth and break the power of its kings. But the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward) and those who act with him, have determined that these hopes shall no longer be cherished, and that our system shall fall, to gratify the wishes and meet the views of the British Exeter Hall anti-slavery society. He holds that our government has hitherto been administered in "violation of the divine

law," and that our former institutions must give way to the "*higher law*," abolitionism, and free negroism. This is the issue we are now called upon to meet.

Should the decision of the ides of November be adverse to the fortunes of the Republic, it will become the high duty of the South, at least, to protect itself. Northern gentlemen, I believe, with great unanimity say that if the conditions were reversed they would not be willing to submit for a moment; and many, like Mr. Fillmore, do us the justice to say that it would be "madness or folly to believe" that we would "submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate" as Fremont. The general tone of feeling in the South, and the rapid formation of vigilance committees and military companies, indicate that our people have not forgotten the lessons of the Revolution, and there may be a contest among the States as to which shall be most prompt to resist.

To avoid any such necessity, our people are disposed, generally, to make every effort consistent with honor. They will, with great unanimity, go into battle upon the old platform of principles, and, waiving all past issues, heartily support the standard-bearer who may be selected. But the fate of the country mainly depends upon the success which may crown the efforts of those brave and patriotic men in the North, who, in spite of the odds arrayed against them, have so long maintained an unequal struggle against the anti-slavery current. They fight under a flag which waves in every State of the Union. Should it fall, it carries with it an older and still more honored emblem—that banner under which Washington marched to victory, which Jackson maintained triumphantly, and which has been borne gallantly and gloriously over every sea. I have still confidence in the good fortune of the United States, and in view of the many providential occurrences in the past, still anticipate a triumph for the Republic.

NOTE.

It should be borne in mind that this speech was made before steps had been taken towards that most extraordinary movement to divide and destroy the Democratic party, which soon afterwards was developed. That conspiracy, in which Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Jefferson Davis and Mr. John Slidell were the most influential actors, so much surpassed in its insanity and wickedness all similar events in the history of humanity, that no one can fairly be blamed for not anticipating it. At no moment since, has it appeared to me as less irrational than it did in its inception. I then compared it to the conduct of a man about to do battle for his life, who should, as a preparatory step, cut off one arm and one leg, in order that he might march and strike with more efficiency.

But for this event, there would almost certainly have been but a single presidential ticket in the South, its whole vote would have been cast solidly, and in the event of defeat, such States as Kentucky would have been not less ready to take action than South Carolina. In fact, Mr. Crittenden, then the most influential member of the Whig party, repeatedly assured me that if we should make a harmonious nomination, he felt confident that his own party would make no nomination whatever. Even after the split at Charleston, he told me that he had used his influence in the convention of his own party to prevent the nomination of Governor Saml. Houston, of Texas, because he feared that he might be strong enough to take some Democratic votes, and thus weaken our candidate. He desired that the Democratic candidate should have the best possible chance to win.

[When the project to divide the party was first brought to the consideration of the Senatorial Democratic caucus, a decided majority of the members was against the movement and in favor of keeping the party united on the platform upon which it had carried the two previous presidential contests. The chief actors in the conspiracy, aided by some others less influential, were indefatigable in their efforts, so that by the time the Charleston Convention had assembled, it was doubtful which party really had the majority among the Democratic Senators. In fact, nearly a third of the Senators seemed to be hesitating between their convictions of what was right in itself, and what would be most agreeable to those who so earnestly entreated their co-operation. It was only at the last moment, just before the convention adjourned over to meet at Baltimore that some of the Senators gave their adhesion to the seceders.

So extraordinary and so monstrous did the action at Charleston seem, that the public mind was bewildered. Some of the Republican papers declared that what was done there was merely a transparent stratagem to strengthen our party at the North. Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, said to me that it was clear that the purpose of the Charleston movement was merely a trick to strengthen Mr. Douglas at the North, by creating the impression there that the Southern *ultras* were against him. Our opponents seemed at first unable to realize the fact that the Democratic leaders should be so insane as thus to seek to destroy themselves in the face of their enemies.

What might be the final result at Baltimore was still in so much doubt that it was deemed by the disorganizers necessary to get the opinion of the Senate on the questions at issue. When the resolutions of Mr. Davis were under consideration, after his speech in their favor, I occupied the floor. As some of the Senators seemed to be in doubt as to their action, and several who had rather given assent to the movement, appeared still to hesitate, suppressing my indignation, I sought to state my opinions in a manner as conciliatory as possible. In fact, I rather lent forward as far as I possibly could towards those opposed to my view, and strained politeness itself in the hope that some might be won back, who seemed not satisfied to take the irrevocable step that was to divide the Democratic party, and ensure the election of a man who had declared that the Union could not endure part slave and part free as it had till then existed.]

SPEECH

ON THE SUBJECT OF CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION AS TO
THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY IN THE TERRITORIES, DELIV-
ERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MAY 7TH
AND 8TH, 1860.

The Senate having under consideration the resolutions offered by Mr. Davis, of Mississippi—

Mr. Clingman said :

MR. PRESIDENT : Most of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Davis) I cordially approve. There are one or two points, however, in which I differ with him ; and notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, if Senators will indulge me, I shall endeavor to state them. If I understand his resolutions aright, they contemplate intervention by Congress for the protection, in the Territories, of property in slaves. For some years past we have stood on the doctrine of non-intervention, and there is no middle ground which we can take.

The Senator from Mississippi says that he does not approve of a slave code. Well, sir, what are we to understand by a slave code ? I take it to be legislation to protect, or to regulate property in slaves. If you depart from the principle of non-intervention, and legislate to protect property in slaves, you necessarily make some sort of a slave code, and it may be either a short one or a long one.

I am opposed to departing, at this time, from the policy of non-intervention. I was not one of the original advocates of that measure. On the contrary, twelve or fifteen years ago, in common with the great body of the South, I maintained the opinion that the Federal Government had complete jurisdiction over the Territories ; and I voted for the extension of the Missouri compromise line to the Pacific. That necessarily implied two things : first, that Congress had power to prohibit slavery in the Territories ; second, that it had power to establish or protect it ; because the original Missouri compromise line declared, in the exact terms of the Wilmot proviso, that north of the line of 36 deg. 30 min. slavery or involuntary servitude never should exist, while it was allowed to remain south of it. Every one of us who voted for the extension of that line thereby necessarily admitted that the Government had authority to establish or protect slavery in a Territory, and also to prohibit it. We were all sworn to support the Constitution ; and if we had denied the power, we could not have given the vote. I am free to say that I subsequently changed my opinion ; and prior to the decision in the Dred Scott case I published my views in accordance with the doctrine laid down in that decision, as I understand it. That, however, is merely personal to myself, and cannot affect the Senate.

But, sir, in 1847, General Cass brought forward the non-intervention doctrine. He was sustained by Daniel S. Dickinson and by John C. Calhoun, and other distinguished statesmen ; and though I was then an opponent of it, I am free to say that I believe its advocates were per-

haps nearer right than I was. So remarkable was the statement of Mr. Calhoun at that time that I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate for a single moment while I read a few extracts from his speech. Some of his remarks were almost prophetic, and anything from him has great weight with gentlemen of the school to which the Senator from Mississippi and myself belong. In his opening remarks in his speech of June 27th, 1848, he said :

“There is a very striking difference between the position in which the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States stand in reference to the subject under consideration. The former desire no action of the Government; demand no law to give them any advantage in the Territory about to be established; are willing to leave it, and other Territories belonging to the United States, open to all their citizens, so long as they continue to be Territories, and when they cease to be so, to leave it to their inhabitants to form such governments as may suit them, without restriction or condition, except that imposed by the Constitution as a pre-requisite for admission into the Union. In short, they are willing to leave the whole subject where the Constitution and the great and fundamental principles of self-government place it.”

What further did he say ?

“Nor should the North fear that, by leaving it where justice and the Constitution leave it, she would be excluded from her full share of the Territories. In my opinion, if it be left there, climate, soil, and other circumstances, would fix the line between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States in about 36 deg. 30 min. It may zig-zag a little, to accommodate itself to circumstances; sometimes passing to the north and at others to the south of it; but that would matter little, and would be more satisfactory to all, and tend less to alienation between the two great sections than a rigid, straight, artificial line, prescribed by an act of Congress.”

* * * * *

“But I go further, and hold that justice and the Constitution are the easiest and safest guard on which the question can be settled, regarded in reference to party. It may be settled on that ground simply by non-action—by leaving the Territories free and open to the emigration of all the world, so long as they continue so; and when they become States, to adopt whatever constitution they please, with the single restriction to be republican, in order to their admission into the Union. If a party cannot safely take this broad and solid position, and successfully maintain it, what other can it take and maintain ?”

Remember this was an earnest exhortation to the Democratic party, prior to the assemblage of its national convention in that year.

“If it cannot maintain itself by an appeal to the great principles of justice, the Constitution, and self-government, to what other, sufficiently strong to uphold them in public opinion, can they appeal? I greatly mistake the character of the people of this Union, if such an appeal would not prove successful, if either party should have the magnanimity to step forward and boldly make it. It would, in my opinion, be received with shouts of approbation by the patriotic and intelligent in every quarter. There is a deep feeling pervading the country that the Union and our political institutions

are in danger, which such a course would dispel.”—*Appendix to Congressional Globe*, first session, Thirtieth Congress, p. 872.

That position was taken by him and others, and maintained, and gradually obtained strength until, in 1850, it received a majority of the votes of the southern members and of the Democratic party, and became a part of the public law of the country. I hold, sir, that this was emphatically a compromise between the sections; and I propose now to give several reasons why I am for maintaining it, although at the time it was adopted I was opposed to it. I place this view in the foreground; northern gentlemen, be it recollected, insisted on the Wilmot proviso, to prohibit slavery in the Territories, and we of the South claimed protection. When the Wilmot proviso was brought up, there were only seven or eight Democrats in the House of Representatives who resisted it. Among them I recollect the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) and his colleague at that time, who is now a member of the other House, and who was voted for at an early day of the session for Speaker, (Mr. McClelland.) Excepting those gentlemen, I believe, there is no one else now in the public councils from the north who opposed it. Many men of the north said, “If we are to legislate to fix the *status* of the Territories, as we represent free communities, we will carry out their views; but if you think proper to turn over the whole question to the people, under the Constitution, we will join you in that, and vote down the Wilmot proviso.” That was subsequently accomplished; and in 1852, when the national convention adopted it, it became the settled policy of the country, and those in the South who had opposed it acquiesced and adopted it.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi argues that that policy of non-intervention did not mean to deny the right to protect; that it merely pledged Congress not to establish or to prohibit slavery, but did not deny protection to it. I might, by adverting to the discussions of that day, show that a different construction was then put upon it by gentlemen generally; but I have some authority here which binds the whole party to which that Senator and myself belong, and which, I think, ought to be conclusive—I mean the last clause of the thirty-second section of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, which the Administration of that day, of which he was a member, made an Administration measure, and which received the support of the Democratic members of the two Houses; and I ask the particular attention of the Senate to the language:

“That the Constitution, and all laws of the United States which are not locally inapplicable, shall have the same force and effect within the said Territory of Kansas as elsewhere within the United States, except the eighth section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, approved March 6, 1820, which, being inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognized by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the compromise measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void; it being the true intent and meaning of this act not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form

and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

The Missouri line was repealed; and why? Because it was unconstitutional or wrong in itself? No, sir; but because it was "inconsistent with the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States and Territories."

I admit, if the act had stopped there, there might have been some plausibility in the argument, but what is the conclusion?

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to revive or put in force any law or regulation which may have existed prior to the act of 6th March, 1820, either protecting, establishing, prohibiting, or abolishing slavery."

That is, Congress would not only not interfere itself; would not only not allow its own statutes to stand in the way, but would not revive any old law which might have been in force by which slavery was protected in that Territory. Is it not perfectly clear that the whole purpose of the act, and of the party at that day, was to free Congress from all legislation over the subject of slavery in the Territories, whether by way of protection, or establishment, or prohibition, and leave the Territory free to act, as the Constitution permitted it? I remember well how that clause came to be inserted in the bill. During the discussion, it was said, by gentlemen who opposed the bill, that if Congress simply repealed the restriction, the result would be that the old Louisiana law, establishing and protecting slavery, would be revived. To meet that argument this clause was introduced, became a part of the bill, and received the support of every friend of the bill who voted for it in both Houses of Congress.

I submit, therefore, that, upon a fair construction of that act, you can come to no other conclusion except that Congress intended to abnegate the exercise of any power over this question in the Territories, and to deny its purpose to legislate, whether to establish or prohibit, or to restrict or protect slavery in the Territories; and in 1856, in our platform, we expressly declared the doctrine, "non intervention with slavery in State or Territory, and in the District of Columbia." Where did that leave it? Congress left it, of course, in the States, to the States; in the Territories—there being no law of Congress left, for that repeal removed the last act of Congress which bore upon them—it left it unaffected in any way by congressional legislation; and in the District of Columbia slavery had already been established, and was protected by law, so that it left it there untouched. I say this declaration received the unanimous assent of all the States represented in the Cincinnati convention. I happened to be a member of that convention—the only convention of the kind which I believe I ever had the honor of being in; and I may have a little personal pride in that matter, but I am very sure I am not mistaken when I say it was unanimously adopted by all the delegates there assembled, alike from the North and the South. We also, out of abundance of caution to meet the views of our oppo-

nents, voted that every new State should be admitted with or without slavery, as it pleased.

Then, Mr. President, where do we stand? The Democracy of the North and the South agreed upon this principle of non-intervention. If there ever was a compromise made under this Government, that was one. Each side surrendered something. We surrendered our claim to protection; our northern friends abandoned the Wilmot proviso, and everything looking to it, and met us on common ground. Though, I was not an original party to the agreement, I am bound to it by my acquiescence; and I hold that neither section can honorably depart from it without some great pressing necessity, which does not now exist.

I know it is said that the Dred Scott decision has modified the question. I confess I do not think so. I fully agree to the decision in the sense in which the Senator from Mississippi explains it; but let us test it for a moment in this way; in that decision the court say the Missouri compromise line, or the Wilmot proviso, is unconstitutional. Granted; but suppose they had decided the other way, and said it was constitutional, would the northern men have had a right to come forward and say, "this question being settled in our favor, the Supreme Court having admitted that the Wilmot proviso is constitutional, we now want to go in for intervention against slavery? I am sure every Democrat in the South would have said at once, "though you have this power, you are not bound to exercise it." Well, suppose the court decided that Congress have the right to protect, and not to prohibit, can we honorably and fairly, without a great pressing necessity, abandon the policy of non-intervention? I think not.

Now, is there any such necessity? The Senator himself admits that there is not. His colleague (Mr. Brown) insists that we ought to have a slave code or congressional legislation on the subject; but the Senator from Mississippi, to whom I am replying, says that there is no such necessity at this time. Then why depart from the principle of non-intervention? I am free to admit that if, in an unwise moment, a man makes a compromise that is ruinous to him, he may, under great necessity, avoid it, perhaps; but I deny that any such necessity exists in this case; and the highest evidence of it is that the Senator from Mississippi, who sits behind me, (Mr. Brown,) has been striving for the last three or four months to get a positive act passed to protect slavery in Kansas, and he has never yet found a second for it. If any one Senator upon this floor, notwithstanding the urgent and eloquent appeals of that gentleman, has declared his willingness to vote for it, I have not heard him say so, and I do not believe there is such a one. And yet everybody knows that Kansas has lately refused all protection to slave property. If gentlemen, therefore, intend to stand up for all their rights to the fullest extent, why not at once come up and pass a law to protect slaves in Kansas? They show, by their conduct, that they do not believe that any real necessity exists in fact for departing from non-intervention.

I say, then, Mr. President, that in my judgment no necessity exists for an abandonment of the compromise; but the Senator proposes to make a declaration that we shall do it in a future contingency. I have no doubt of the power of the Government, but why make that declaration? A declaration of the Senate binds nobody. These are naked

resolutions ; they are not laws ; they carry no force to the country except what may be derived from the soundness of the opinions advanced in them. They will not control the actions of the courts. They will not, perhaps, change the opinion of a single man in this country. Why pass them ? I think I shall show, before I take my seat, some very valid and strong reasons why we should not do so.

My first objection, then, is, that the system of non-intervention is a compromise, and that no necessity exists to abandon it, as I have already stated. I come now to my second objection. During the discussion of 1850, the advocates of non-intervention said, if you adopt it, if you leave the question to the Territorial Legislature, they may pass laws to protect slave property. I resisted it. I made speech after speech to show that the Mexicans were hostile to us ; that they were not accustomed to slavery, and might legislate against it ; but what has been the result ? New Mexico has passed the most stringent slave code. There is, perhaps, not a State in the Union that has, by law, protected slave property more securely than the Territory of New Mexico, which reaches from Texas to the Gulf of California, and extends up to the thirty-eighth degree of north latitude. We were content with the line of 36 deg. 30 min., we were willing to run the Missouri line to the Pacific, and to abolish slavery absolutely north of 36 deg. 30 min., and take a mere implication without an express protection south of it. Sir, practically by non-intervention, we have got more than we asked for ; we have got a larger amount of territory than we should have obtained under the Missouri compromise line. Gentlemen may say, perhaps, that Kansas legislated against us. I grant it ; but we should not have got Kansas at all under the Missouri compromise. Kansas only comes down to the thirty-seventh parallel, the whole Territory being north of the Missouri compromise line. Besides, while New Mexico has legislated in our favor, and the same thing, I believe, is true of Utah—

Mr. Green. I wish to correct the Senator in a matter of fact. Utah has not passed any law protecting slavery. They have an apprentice system, which expires in a very short time.

Mr. Clingman. I am obliged to the gentleman for the suggestion ; but I consider the fact with reference to Utah immaterial, because it lies on a table land several thousand feet above the sea, very far north, reaching up to the forty-second parallel, and having a very cold climate. Surely, the Senator does not deny the fact that, as far as New Mexico is concerned, we have got everything we desire, and that it covers more territory than we claimed in 1850. I was about to say, though, that even in Kansas slave property was protected by the Territorial Legislature for several years, but lately they have legislated against it. I believe that, but for the extraordinary excitement which grew up out of the repeal of the Missouri restriction, the Territory of Kansas never would have legislated adversely to us, but we all know that a great crowd were sent in there from the North, with extreme anti-slavery views, and the result of the excitement there has been legislation against us ; but we are no worse off in that respect than if we had never repealed the restriction, and we are much better off as far as the Territory of New Mexico is concerned, by adopting non-intervention.

Mr. Crittenden. Will the gentleman give way to a motion to adjourn ?

Mr. Clingman. As it is late, if there is no objection to the question going over until to-morrow, it will be more agreeable to me.

Mr. Crittenden. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate adjourned.

TUESDAY, MAY 8, 1860.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I hope I shall not find it necessary to occupy much of the time of the Senate. When I commenced last evening I thought I should be able to conclude very soon; but finding that the explanations which I wished to make would take a little more time than I had anticipated, I gave way for a motion to adjourn. I will now express, as rapidly as I can, my impressions on this question; and it is, perhaps, due to myself to say that, on the 9th of January, 1857, I published a letter indicating my views on the whole subject, in which I took the position that this Government had a right and was bound to protect property in the Territories, but could not abolish or exclude it, and that a Territorial Legislature could have no greater power than Congress, which created the Territory. In that letter I said:

"The right to legislate over the Territories of the United States has, by some persons, been derived from that clause of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property of the United States. Others maintain that, as an incident to the power to admit new States, the right to prepare the Territory for the condition of a State authorizes legislation.

"If neither of these clauses should be deemed sufficient to authorize legislation, then it may be contended that, in the first place, it must now be admitted as a settled matter, that the Government of the United States is capable of acquiring territory by treaty, conquest, or discovery, and of holding or exercising authority over the same. But the Government derives all of its powers from the Constitution; and, but for that instrument, the President, the Senators, and members of Congress, would have no more over power the Territory than any other set of people, three hundred in number.

"It is, however, universally admitted that the Government of the United States is only a trustee of power, or agent for the people of the United States, and must exercise its authority for their benefit. As the Government derives its power solely from the Constitution, it cannot go beyond that instrument, and is bound by its limitations therefore. It could not, for example, in the Territory, grant titles of nobility, establish religion, abridge the freedom of speech or of the press, &c. Whichever of these three sources of power be assumed as the true one, it seems clear that Congress and the President, in holding the territory, or exercising jurisdiction over it, can only legislate to the extent required to protect the interest of the Government and of the people of the United States. The preservation of its own property, and the protection of the property and personal rights of the people, limit the extent of its powers. It is bound, however, to legislate or 'make needful rules,' to that extent.

"A B enters the Territory with his wife, child, horse, and slave. These are taken away from him by force, and he is himself imprisoned. Now, it is obvious that there should be laws to protect his own liberty, and also his right to the possession of his wife, child, horse, and slave. Hence, it follows that there must be power in Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery

as well as in relation to wives, children, and horses. It is clear that the Government has power to protect these rights. Can it go further? The Constitution declares, that 'private property shall not be taken for public use (even) without just compensation.' The Government cannot, therefore, take any property, or, what is the same thing, release another from an obligation to me, which is in the nature of property. While it may protect, it cannot destroy personal rights.

"It must be remembered, however, that every slave in the United States is necessarily the property of some person; but, as the Government of the United States cannot destroy or take away property, it cannot, of course, change the relation of any one in these respects. If a person is under obligation to serve me for life, or a shorter term, he cannot be released from that obligation by Congress, because it cannot take my property by any law that it can pass, whether the law is to operate in a State or Territory. In the latter it is bound to preserve, that is, protect, existing rights; but it cannot destroy them. If, therefore, its power is limited to the preservation of rights now in being, such a law as the Missouri compromise, which would destroy rights that already exist in certain citizens, would be unconstitutional, since it might, and in fact must, necessarily interfere with property in slaves. It seems to me that these propositions cover the whole ground of controversy; and hence, if they are held to be true, Congress cannot, 'except for public use,' and with 'just compensation,' deprive any person of an obligation on another, or declare that the owner's right to his slave shall not be recognized in any Territory of the United States. And if Congress has not the power itself, then it cannot delegate it; and hence the Kansas-Nebraska bill does not carry with it any such power."

I yesterday alluded to the opinions of Mr. Calhoun. It is perhaps right that I should say that, in the very same speech from which I read, he expressed the opinion that a Territorial Legislature had no right to exclude slavery, or to legislate against it. I concur with him in that. He also, I think almost uniformly, perhaps invariably, held that Congress had a right and ought to protect all property in the Territories subject to its jurisdiction; but he waived that right in his speech, to which I referred, and in his support of the Clayton compromise bill, which passed at the same session of Congress, and only a few weeks afterwards, he again waived it. By the provisions of that bill, Congress did not legislate at all in relation to slavery in the Territories, but transferred the subject to the Territorial Legislature, with an inhibition that they should have no power to abolish or establish slavery—those were the terms—but saying nothing as to how far they might legislate. It turned over the whole subject to them, and left them to legislate, subject, of course, to the control of the courts. That was the prominent idea of that bill.

Now, sir, one other remark in connection with the first point which I made. During the discussion of 1850, I insisted that if the gentlemen would come forward and repeal the Missouri restriction, and throw open all the territory, I would agree to take it; and in fact, in a speech in the House of Representatives, I agreed to vote for this principle if they would remove the restriction up to the fortieth parallel, from 36 deg. 30 min., considering that sufficient compensation. It was not done, however, and I opposed the scheme. But, in 1854, the northern portion of

the Democratic party, with great magnanimity and with great risk to themselves, came up and repealed this old restriction. In doing that they had to encounter prejudices at home; they had to take upon their shoulders the responsibility of repealing a line which had been regarded as sanctified by thirty-four years' existence, and which was called a compromise. They had the manliness, in carrying out this principle of non-intervention, to come forward and repeal that line. Why? It was in order that all the territory might be placed upon the same footing; and I hold that after that sacrifice upon their part; that willingness to carry out this compromise, begun in 1556, indorsed in 1852 by the Democratic and also by the Opposition convention, we of the South are under the highest obligation to stand to it. Now, sir, I make no reflection on any honorable Senator who differs with me on this question. I do them all the justice to say that, if they looked upon it as I do, as a compromise, I am very sure they would not seek to disturb it. Taking the view of it I do, believing that the two parties settled down upon non-intervention, I feel it to be my duty to adhere to it in the absence of any great pressing necessity which would justify its abandonment.

Mr. President, what are the points of difference between the two parties? The Senator from Mississippi, if I read his resolutions aright, does not propose to favor intervention by Congress to protect slavery in the Territories at this time; but he declares if it should turn out hereafter that the existing laws are not sufficient to protect it under the Constitution, he is then for legislation. What do those who oppose his resolutions say? The Senator from Ohio (Mr. Pugh) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) say that if, hereafter, the courts shall make decisions which cannot be carried out without legislation, they will legislate to carry them out. The Senator from Mississippi says that the Dred Scott decision has settled the question, and he wants a declaration that we mean to legislate in future. These gentlemen, admitting, as they must, that the judges have, in the Dred Scott case, expressed their opinion that a Territorial Legislature cannot legislate adversely to slavery, say, however, that point in fact was not presented in the case; but that, if such was the settled opinion of the court, when a proper case is directly presented it will so decide; and they stand ready to carry out that decision of the court when it shall be made.

Then, do we not all come together on the same point? The Senator from Mississippi says that if the court makes decisions which cannot be enforced without legislation, he is for legislation. These gentlemen say that when the court does make decisions, they will submit to them and carry them out. It seems, therefore, that they are traveling in lines that will converge and come together at a certain point. Then, why dispute now in advance?

This may be readily illustrated. Suppose I have a controversy with a neighbor about the title to a piece of land. Neither of us is in a hurry to have possession. We are willing to await the decision of the court. He comes to me, however, and says: "I find that the court, in expressing an opinion in another case, which I admit is not like ours, and does not present the same facts, has declared, nevertheless, that in a case like yours and mine my title would be good, and therefore I wish you to give me a deed acknowledging my title to be good, though I do not want

possession now, and am willing to wait for it until the case is decided." I reply to him, "I admit that the court may have expressed such an opinion, but the point between us did not arise in that case, was not argued by my counsel or any other counsel; all I can say to you is, if that be the opinion of the court, of course, when they decide our case, they will decide in your favor, and I shall then surrender to you; but I am not willing to assume beforehand that the court will so decide." It seems to me, then, Mr. President, that in the present condition of the case there is no necessity for ill-feeling on either side, or for declarations in advance.

My second point was, that New Mexico had already established a slave code and given us more territory than we should have gotten under the Missouri line, if carried out. I come now to the third point, and that is, what has grown out of the decision of the court in the *Dred Scott* case. When this subject was under debate in 1850, we of the South objected to non-intervention on the ground that it would leave the Mexican law in force; and inasmuch as the Supreme Court had maintained the opinion in a case from Florida, and perhaps in some other decisions, that where territory was acquired the local law might remain in force, we were disinclined to take non-intervention without a repeal of the Mexican law. During that interesting controversy, we held a caucus of southern members, consisting of Senators and Representatives, and on that occasion the Senator from Georgia, who usually sits behind me, (Mr. Toombs,) introduced a proposition into our caucus that we would support the compromise measure if they would repeal the Mexican laws and substitute the British colonial laws which prevailed in our colonies prior to the Revolution. That was adopted, and that gentleman moved it in the House of Representatives as an amendment, but it was defeated. I am free to say that if at that time we had been satisfied that the court would hold that under the Constitution slave property could exist and be protected in the Territories, without reference to local laws, I am very sure we should all have voted for the compromise of 1850.

If it be true, as the Senator from Mississippi contends, that the *Dred Scott* decision settles the question and supports the right of a slaveholder in a Territory, then there is another strong reason why we should acquiesce in non-intervention at this time. This, therefore, is a third reason; and I now propose to give one or two others why a person like myself, who originally did not adopt it, may now be for it.

It has been adopted as the policy of the country for ten years. Can we now pass through resolutions or bills to establish or protect slavery in the Territories? That is the question. Recollect, it is only in a case where the people of a Territory are hostile to our rights; it is only where they are so hostile that they refuse to protect us, or even legislate against us that we have been called upon to exercise this power. Nobody pretends that there is any necessity for our going into New Mexico, or other Territories that are favorable to us, with this legislation. Therefore, the question presented is simply this: suppose a Territory is hostile to us, and its Legislature will not protect slave property, or even legislate against it, will Congress intervene? First, is there any political possibility that we can pass such a law through the two Houses? We have had a test on the question already. Here is the Territory of Kan-

sas, which not only does not give us any protection, but which, I am informed, has legislated adversely. One Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Brown) has brought forward a proposition to interfere for the protection of slavery in that Territory, and yet he has not got one Southern man to back him; and if you were to submit the question to a body of Southern Senators I have very great doubt whether you would get them to agree to such legislation. Why is it? If we of the South are willing to impose the institution—that is the common phrase—on a Territory against the wish of a majority, why is it that gentlemen do not come up and support the proposition of the Senator from Mississippi? Is it because it is felt that it is politically and morally wrong to interfere in this way? Is that it, or is it because gentlemen know that such legislation would be unavailing? I ask why we have not induced southern Senators yet to come up and vote for the establishment or protection of slavery in Kansas, notwithstanding the adverse legislation of the territorial authorities? I leave every gentleman to give his own reasons. But suppose every southern Senator went for it, we could not pass it; and how many northern men are there who are ready to vote for it? How many northern members are there in the other House for it? It will take thirty northern Representatives to pass through such a bill. We all know what a clamor was raised two or three years ago by the Abolitionists—falsely raised—when it was alleged that Congress intended to force slavery upon the Territory of Kansas, whether it wished it or not. Now, if we undertake to protect or maintain slavery in a Territory against the wish of the inhabitants, I ask you how many northern men are likely to sustain us in it? At present we have no southern men for it that I know of except one. There may be others; but they have not thought proper after a debate of three months, to state the fact. But suppose they come up and do it, how many men will you get from the north? I hold that it is a political impossibility that we should pass such a measure; and, as I shall presently endeavor to show, nothing but mischief will result from the attempt.

But suppose there were nothing in this fourth objection of mine, and that Congress should actually pass a law of that sort, how much would it be worth in a Territory where the people are thoroughly adverse to it and unwilling that the institution should exist or be protected? If you are going to enforce the law, you must send either an army or an immense number of officials, and scatter them all over the Territory. Gentlemen know now how difficult it is to recover a runaway negro from the free States. From some of these States you can only get him by the help of an army. It was stated the other day, in a speech by a member of the Republican party, who, I suppose, knows—I mean Mr. Raymond, who was once Lieutenant Governor of New York—that of the runaways who went to the north, not one in five hundred ever was recovered; and yet it is much easier to send a posse or a body of troops there to get a single negro at one point and return him, than it would be to support an army and protect it over a whole Territory. But, nevertheless, suppose you could maintain it there, what then? Everybody on our side of the House admits that when they make a State constitution, they have a right to exclude it. Have you, or I, or any other man, the least doubt that when such a people made a State constitution they

would make it anti-slavery? Any community on earth who had forced upon them a system to which they were adverse would inevitably throw it off when they could. What would be the result? Every State brought into the Union under these circumstances would not only be a free State, but would probably be abolitionized; probably strong anti-slavery features would be thrown into its constitution. What advantage is that to us of the South, I ask gentlemen? We would like to have slave States; they would give us additional strength in the two Houses of Congress; but slave Territories are worth nothing to us—they give us no strength. We should like to have slave Territories that might be formed into slave States; but if we can only have them under a system which is almost sure to make them germinate into free and hostile States, they are of no advantage whatever to us.

I have now, Mr. President, given some five reasons why, in my judgment, even if non-intervention had not been right originally, it would be the true policy now; but gentlemen say, if it is our right to have protection, let us insist upon it. I take it for granted that every man believes he has rights which he cannot insist on at all times. No man will insist on an abstract, remote sort of right which he can turn to no practical advantage, and thereby merely incur very great losses. If a man believed that he had a certain valuable property in the moon, nobody would expect him to attempt to get at it there either by balloons or otherwise. Everybody would regard it as an impossibility, and any expenditure of time and money that he made to effect it would be regarded as thrown away. I am free to say that, in my judgment, there is about as much probability of effecting a thing of that sort as there is of getting through Congress, and maintaining, a system of legislation to protect slavery in Territories that are so utterly hostile to it, that they make their Legislature act against it, and then to bring them in as slaveholding States. One is a political, the other a physical impossibility. I think we shall lose by the operation; and this brings me to another class of objections.

If we take this system of congressional intervention for the protection of slavery, we must act in opposition to the settled policy of the Democratic party for the last ten years. Then you necessarily divide the party. The movement will not divide our opponents; they will all stand as they now do, firmly united against us; but we shall divide our own party into two sections, and I beg leave to call the attention of Senators to the fact that, on looking over the resolutions adopted in the Democratic conventions of the free States—and I have examined all of them but one—every single one of them, as far as I know or believe, has declared in favor of the Cincinnati platform, and non-intervention. So have many of the southern States likewise. If we adopt a different policy, all these gentlemen must change their ground at once, or be driven out of the party. I ask you, Mr. President, can they maintain themselves before their opponents under this disadvantage? Suppose, for example, the delegation from Pennsylvania go home from a convention where the policy of intervention has been adopted: how will their opponents meet them? Their Republican opponents will say to them: "you have all been fighting for ten years upon the principle of non-intervention, and at your State convention, last March, you passed reso-

lutions, without division, unanimously declaring that Congress had no power to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories; and that it would not be expedient for them to exercise it, if they had it; you went to the national convention, and the slave power have imposed on you an intervention plank—a plank by which you will have to legislate slavery into and maintain it in the Territories.” They will call it, of course, a slave code. Will our friends be able to maintain themselves advantageously under these circumstances? I put it to the common sense of everybody if that can be expected. I will not say, as a southern gentleman said to me the other day, who was in favor of a southern candidate at Charleston, that if the angel Gabriel was put upon a slave-code plank he would be defeated all through the north. I do not know anything about what sort of a run angels would make; but I am clearly of the opinion that it would weaken any candidate we run in the north. Why? All men have a pride of opinion; all men have a regard for consistency. If this were a new question, and no ground had ever been taken upon it, it is possible that we might bring up many gentlemen to the point of passing a proposition to protect slavery in the Territories; but when they have stood upon non-intervention for ten years; when all their conventions have adopted it, I ask you if it is possible that they can be prepared, at this time, to turn right about, and go for intervention. It does not help the matter at all that this thing is held up *in futuro*. Suppose it be said that “whenever it is necessary, Congress must legislate to protect slave property:” the Abolitionists would say in this canvass, “it will be necessary as soon as the presidential election is over, if you carry the day.” They will say that, of course. Our friends, perhaps, may dispute it, and say they think it will be a long time before it is necessary; but that is the argument they will have to meet. The Abolitionists will hold up all the bloody slave codes from the time of Draco down, and tell the northern people that this is the music they have got to face. If we are going to legislate at all, I have no doubt upon earth it would be better for us to pass a statute now, declaring that slave and all other property should be protected in all the Territories of the United States during the territorial condition; because men would see that statute, would know what it meant, and have a better chance to defend it.

But again, Mr. President, it is argued that there are differences of opinion on the subject of non-intervention and the meaning of the Cincinnati platform. I really do not think there is any difference of opinion as far as the action of Congress is concerned. I think no man can read that platform, or the Nebraska bill, or the speeches on that occasion, without seeing that we are all agreed so far as congressional action is concerned. I have extracts from the speeches of many southern Senators and Representatives upon the occasion of the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, but I do not choose to read them. In the first place, the *argumentum ad hominem* is not a very convincing one to an intelligent mind. In the next place, to show that this was the universal opinion of the party then, as I could do in this way, I should have to take up the time of the Senate to too great length, and I should also, perhaps, oblige gentlemen to make explanations of their positions. But I think it abundantly clear that Congress was not to interfere with the subject;

that the difference of opinion was upon the point after that—what would be the effect of congressional non-intervention. Some gentlemen said that the Territories might legislate to protect slavery, but not to prohibit it. Others said they might legislate either to prohibit it or not. This question, from necessity, is one that the courts must determine. Suppose a law is passed by a Territorial Legislature: who determines its constitutionality and validity? The courts. Our opinion will not control the courts. Suppose the Senate should resolve unanimously that a particular thing was legal and constitutional: the Supreme Court, or any other court, would not be bound to adopt it at all. There is, in fact, no difference, as far as the action of Congress is required, on the subject. We differ as to what the court will decide about the power of a Territory. I, for example, believe, and have said again and again that I think the court will hold, that a Territorial Legislature has a right to protect property, and cannot legislate against it. I think so. Somebody else entertains an opposite opinion. It is necessarily a judicial question.

But again, sir, it is said that the Cincinnati platform, with the doctrine of non-intervention, is construed differently by different people. So is the Constitution of the United States; and yet we have never thought proper to make a new Constitution. So is the Bible: the churches have divided about it for the last two thousand years or more; and yet Providence has not thought proper to favor us with a new Bible. Nobody has asked it. Perhaps I am wrong—I believe the Abolitionists have said that the times demanded an anti-slavery Constitution, an anti-slavery Bible, and an anti-slavery God; and they have made for themselves a new constitution in the “higher law,” and, for aught I know, they may adopt Joe Smith’s Mormon Bible. They have easily found a divinity in John Brown; and some of them are relying, they say, “on him, and him hanged.” But I do not find that any considerable portion of the Christian world asks for a new divinity or a different Bible, and yet they differ about it. So with regard to the Constitution. It turns out, therefore, that the Cincinnati platform stands in the same position with these other great instruments in this respect.

What has occurred since 1856? I was a member of the convention when that platform was adopted at Cincinnati, and it was unanimously adopted, and was satisfactory. What has occurred since? I know of nothing that is supposed to have any bearing upon it, except the Dred Scott decision. If gentlemen say that that ought to be a part of our platform, I doubt whether anybody will object. Every Democrat that I know of yields to the decisions of the courts on questions of that kind. I prefer, though, taking the decision itself to any man’s commentary upon it, just as I would prefer adopting the Bible to the views of any commentator. If I should attempt to read in any court what somebody said was a former decision, the judges would stop me, and say, “Give us the decision itself;” because the judges know their opinions, and can express them better than anybody else.

But, Mr. President, I may say that I look upon platforms for candidates very much as I do the weights that are put upon horses. I think the less of a platform you hamper a candidate with, generally,

so you express your principles clearly, the better; just as the less weight you put upon a horse, the better race he runs. I have a great many rights that were not in the Cincinnati platform. I do not expect to have them all put into it. To get them there, I should have to have the Constitution of the United States certainly all there, and the Constitution of my own State, and no doubt some other great natural rights that are not in either. My friend from Missouri Mr. (Green) suggests to me the Bible, also. Are we to expect everything to be put in? If we do, I do not know how large we would make it. It would be just as absurd as if a man who had a horse that was going to run a great race, and on which he had bet largely, should put upon his back all the property he had in the shape of kettles, mill-stones, or anything else cumbersome. That would be the height of absurdity. I tell you further, Mr. President, after we get a candidate in the field, and he is running against our adversaries over the way, the very gentlemen who may now be disposed to quibble, and who want to insist on this and that, if they saw that he was hampered and was likely to lose support, would be very sorry that he was placed in a false position. My real liking for the Cincinnati platform was, that it had been four years before the country, everybody understood it, and it was not necessary to debate it or talk about it further in the canvass. As it contained all the principles in issue between the parties, I preferred waging the fight on it, with the addition only of the Dred Scott decision, if gentlemen desired it.

I know, however, that there are several classes of persons who will not agree with me in these views. In the first place, there are some gentlemen who are called disunionists *per se*; that is, persons who think sound policy requires a dissolution of the Union. I know some who entertain these views. They are men of ability, intelligence, public spirit, and patriotism. I have no doubt about that. They honestly believe that this government is a failure. They think this slavery agitation has been continued to that extent that it has paralyzed the government for useful purposes; that it will grow worse and worse; and that the Union had better be dissolved and a new system of government made. They are honorable men, or many of them, at least, are known to me as such. They believe that if the Democratic party were destroyed, a great step would be taken in that direction; and I am free to admit it. They suppose, therefore, that by pressing extreme views, by having the South to insist, for example, on slave protection in Territories, while the North is for non-intervention, we may either break up the party or defeat it in the coming election. I shall not enter into an argument with such gentlemen as to how far they are right. I think they are wrong. It seems to me they are incapable of learning by experience. There is one thing they might have learned, and that is, that they cannot drive a majority of the Southern people into a line of action of that kind. They may by expressing their extreme opinions, involve us in difficulties, divide us at the South, and weaken our influence in the country.

I thought, in 1850, that my section suffered because certain gentlemen deemed it proper, very unwisely, in my judgment, to express

these views and divide us at home. Mr. Calhoun made a remark, which was reported to me, shortly before his death, which I refer to, because, in my judgment, it illustrates the feeling of the South, and, as I have alluded to him, I beg leave to say that, having once, in my earlier years, in some speech spoken in a manner not kind to him, I take great pleasure in saying, on this occasion, that my opinion was subsequently changed, and I am satisfied that I did him great injustice. His course in 1848, on the Clayton compromise, satisfied me; because he agreed to take a measure which he thought fell greatly short of our rights, for the sake of peace and harmony; and his course in 1850 satisfied me that he had no ulterior designs against the government; that he was very anxious, provided it could be kept on the line of the Constitution, to preserve it. But, sir, the remark to which I allude, was this: after I saw him for the last time—for I believe the last conversation I had with him was on the last day he was in the Senate, and if I were to repeat it, which it is not necessary that I should do, it would only be creditable to him and his views—a gentleman, from South Carolina, then a colleague of his, a gentleman with whom I was on terms of great intimacy—said in the House one day to me in conversation, “last evening, when I was talking to Mr. Calhoun, by his bed-side, giving him my views as to what would be the effect of a dissolution of the Union, he stopped me; and he always stops me at that point. He said, ‘you may be right in your opinions, your argument is very plausible. I admit that I cannot answer it, but there may come in disturbing causes which would change all this. The effect of a dissolution is one of the great problems which the human mind cannot grasp; all we can say is, that if the North force it upon us we must make up our minds to take it.’” That, I think, was substantially his position, that if we could maintain our equality and our rights in the Union, we ought to stand by it; but, if forced to take the other alternative, we ought to make up our minds to do it. I think this illustrates the view of the great majority of the people of the South. They have no such blind reverence for the Union, or for this government, as to submit to it when their great essential rights are invaded; but they will not in advance of such an emergency, take steps to produce its dissolution.

My own opinions on that subject have already been sufficiently expressed, and there was no part of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi yesterday, able and eloquent as it was, that I heard with more pleasure than I did those declarations of his in which he warned gentlemen on the other side of the effect that would follow their attempt to carry out their views. I expressed my opinions early this session; I expressed them in the Fremont contest, and I shall stand upon them; and in such a contingency, I doubt whether any gentleman will be more zealous, though doubtless many be more able than myself.

But, sir, the people of the Southern States will not regard it as a sufficient reason to break up the Democratic party, much less to justify revolution, that we are obliged to stand upon the old Cincinnati platform. It was the unanimous feeling of the South, four years ago, and of the Democracy of the North, that the Cincinnati platform was right.

Because our convention chooses to adhere to it now, or to adhere to it substantially, you cannot induce the majority of the Southern people to dissolve the Democratic party; and hence I regret extremely that a portion of our friends in the South found it necessary, in their judgment, to withdraw from the convention. All those gentlemen that I know are men of high honor, courage and ability. I think they made a mistake. But, be that as it may, a large majority of the Southern delegates, in the proportion of seventy to fifty, remained in the convention.

Something is said, I know, about the cotton States withdrawing. I have great respect for cotton, and if we are to have a king, I would as soon acknowledge that cotton is king as anybody else. But, sir, I cannot admit that the men who are planting cotton are necessarily wiser or better than those in old Virginia, who are cultivating tobacco and wheat, and no cotton at all. Virginia has as much interest in slavery and the slave question as the Gulf States. We ought all to act together. We ought all to go into the contest and make a common fight. I will say, however, though I may be treading on delicate ground, that if I even thought statesmanship required a dissolution of the Union, I should have a choice as to how it should be effected, looking to future results. For example: if we were to go into a common struggle, with our Democratic friends in the North aiding us, they would at least see that we had done all that men could be expected to do to maintain our rights, and they would sympathize, to some extent, with us in any action which we might have to take. On the other hand, if we were to cut loose from them, make a purely sectional party, say that the whole North was hostile, we should, of course, solidify it against us; and, I think, with due deference to the opinion of others, it would be the most insane policy that could be adopted. If there were ten men hostile to me, and ten others whom I have as friends, would it not be the height of folly for me to make the whole twenty hostile, and turn them all against me?

But I come, Mr. President, to consider a second class who do not agree with me on this question. There are some gentlemen who think that these national conventions are mischievous things, and that they had better be broken up. Some believe that if the conventions were broken up, we should have candidates put out, who might run better. I think this is all a mistake. The country is not in the condition in which it was in 1824, when there was but one party. Then they could dispense with conventions safely, and every man support the candidate of his choice. Now, there is a formidable organization, which, four years ago, was almost strong enough to get possession of the government, which I believe has revolutionary objects in view; and if we divide, I think we surrender the government to them. Suppose we had a Southern candidate running in the fifteen slave States, and a Northern candidate running. I do not believe we could bring the same force to support our man in the South that we could bring to the support of one carrying the national Democratic banner. The great argument which has been used with us, and the most effective, to bring men to our support, North and South, is, that the Democratic party is

one which stands up in thirty-three States, and makes fight everywhere. Its flag waves from Maine to California, and men are everywhere marshaled under it. Cut it in two, and many patriots and good men, who did not belong to it originally, but who have come into it recently, will fall off. I perceive that some of the Republican papers said very sagaciously, when they thought the Democracy was broken to pieces, that they were to have a triumph, because a great many conservative and timid men supported the Democratic party to preserve the Union, and would now leave it. Sir, I do not consider it a reproach to any man to say that he is timid in reference to public calamities. Those men who are the bravest in matters that concern themselves personally, are often the most anxious and careful for their country and its rights; and I say it is honorable to any man, no matter what his past opinions may have been, that he stands up to protect the great interests of his country at the sacrifice of party prejudices. I hold, then, that those gentlemen who think advantage will result from breaking up the party, if such there be, are unwise.

There is a third class of persons who wish to press these extreme views, not with any purpose to assail the integrity of the government, or to break up the party, but who desire simply to use them to make capital for particular candidates against other candidates. I think they are very unwise in that. If you can only get a candidate nominated by going in opposition to about half the States of the Union and their views, and by making a platform that drives off particular men, are you likely to elect such a candidate? I ask, in all soberness, could you possibly so change your platform as to drive off some of your candidates, because they are too strong to be beaten otherwise, and expect to succeed? I do not believe it; and I say, therefore, that of the three classes of men that are opposed to the view I am taking, the first are the only wise ones. To the last I would say if they get a candidate nominated upon intervention, I greatly fear he would be defeated, and if they have separate candidates, I have no doubt they will be. I hold, then, that the only wise men of these three classes are those who believe the government had better be broken up; because if they can destroy the Democratic party in any way, they will have made a great stride in that direction.

Before quitting this branch of the subject, I desire to allude to another remark that is often made in the country. It is said somewhat tauntingly, I think, by thoughtless Southern men, that as to the Northern States, they cannot be counted upon as Democratic; that no one of them is certainly Democratic, and that their views ought not to be heard. Mr. President, I think it comes with a bad grace from any Southern man to throw this out. Upon the old issues upon which the Democratic party was built up, the great body of the North would be Democratic to-day—there is no doubt about that—and the South might not unanimously be so. In the very last contest that turned upon these old issues, in 1848, nearly half the South voted for the Whig candidate, and the North was divided in about the same proportion. At that time the anti-slavery movement, which had previously existed, gained such power that our elections since then have turned upon

the slavery question, and they have gained strength, I admit, against our friends; but we of the South have no right to boast of our position. The only fight has been with the Abolitionists in the last two elections. When I say Abolitionists, perhaps I use too strong a term. I mean the anti-slavery party, consisting of Abolitionists, Free-Soilers, and others. We boast in the South that they have made no inroads among us. Why, sir, if an Abolitionist were to come into the part of the country where I live, or were to manifest himself in any way, the best thing he could do would be to emigrate very rapidly, and if he did not carry with him a little tar and feathers he would be quite lucky. Are we to boast and plume ourselves on the idea that in fighting the Abolitionists we can carry the Southern States? If we could not we should not be worth anything; but where they exist in the North they are formidable, and there they have beaten many of our friends. Those friends are fighting this battle, not for their personal rights or to protect their own immediate interests. Far from it. If you abolish slavery, it would not take the property of any man in the free States. I admit that indirectly it might ultimately prejudice their citizens. Their interest is not at all what ours is; and yet they have the manliness to stand up and fight the Abolitionists from year to year. They are beaten down from time to time in many of the States. They give up all the honor of representing their people in the Federal councils: they lose State place, and power and office; and because they are defeated and cut down, we find Southern men taunting them with their diminished numbers. Mr. President, when General Scott reached the city of Mexico, would it have been just for him to turn around to the Palmetto regiment, which from its gallantry in many battles had lost more men than any one in his army, and say to them: "You are a mere skeleton of a regiment: you do not amount to half a regiment; the greater part of you have been killed or left on the road to die: the few of you that have come up here are scarred and maimed and halt: your very flag is shot to pieces: I do not consider you worthy to remain in my camp; I want these sleek, full regiments that came in late, and did not see the enemy, to make up my army." Or suppose when George Washington's army was returning from one of its hard campaigns, an American had taunted its soldiers with being half clad and emaciated and wounded, what would have been thought of him? I hold, sir, with the Senator from Georgia, (Mr. Toombs) that no applause and no honors can be too high to be heaped on these men, and, as he said, instead of throwing additional burdens on them, by narrowing the platform, I would rather widen it, and give them all the aid and support possible. I would allow every man to come upon it in this fight, which we have against the public enemy.

Mr. President, in 1854, we repealed the Missouri compromise line, and a great many of our Northern friends were cut down; and the Congress elected in 1855 had, I believe, a majority of two to one against the Democracy; but they resolutely went to work and recovered their ground, so far as not only to elect Mr. Buchanan in 1856, but to secure a majority in Congress. We all know that the discussion on the Lecompton bill, and the movements then made, hurt us again. I do

not undertake to say who is to blame for this, but I speak of the fact. The consequence was, in the next election the Democratic party in the North suffered severely. Take the State of Pennsylvania for example. Instead of seventeen members of Congress that our party there elected in 1856, we only got two or three in 1858. Our friends have been recovering their ground again, and are ready to go into the fight with high hopes. Now I ask if it is wise policy for us in the South to seek to get the platform changed just before another election—a total radical change, from non-intervention to intervention? I am free to say that I have very great apprehensions that such a thing would lead to a defeat, and hence, I would not make the change even if there were not other valid objections to it.

We all know, Mr. President, who were here in this city four or five days ago, that when the reports came that the secession had occurred at Charleston, and it was supposed that the Democratic party was broken up and destroyed, that every one who met our Republican opponents was struck with their jubilant expression. If they had actually carried the election, and got into power, they could not have shown more elation. They thought that the Democratic party, which they had in vain endeavored to destroy, had killed itself by committing political suicide. But when, on Thursday morning last, we learned that the convention had adjourned over to meet in Baltimore, their faces were very much elongated. I have no doubt they would like that we should get into such collisions and divisions as would enable them to triumph over us; but I do not think they are destined to have this gratification. The Democratic party has great vitality, because it stands on the great principles of the Constitution; it has good and true men in every section of the country, and I entertain the highest hopes that they will yet come together and make a harmonious nomination.

It is to be regretted exceedingly, however, that we should have these debates on immaterial questions. Senators upon this floor are representative men; and hence when we embark in discussions, and squabble over these points which are small in themselves, we tend to divide our people at home; and I forebore to embark in this discussion, for this reason. The question was connected, also, somewhat with the aspirations and claims of different presidential candidates, and I felt a delicacy in embarking in it; and I do so now only with extreme reluctance. As a citizen, I have a right to my opinions. As a Senator, I regard myself as a member of a co-ordinate branch which is the equal of the President; and, as a Senator, I have no desire to interfere with the presidential contest. There are reasons which will strike every mind why I ought not to do so, and why I think no Senator should. We have a rule of the Senate which requires us in debate to avoid personality and personal allusions; and yet, sir, some half a dozen perhaps of the Senators here are prominent candidates for the presidency; and if I should interfere to aid one of them, I necessarily get up discussions as to the personal merits of these gentlemen. I cannot indeed do so without doing violence to my own feelings. I see

at my side the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) whom I know to be a very thorough Democrat, who has fought the Abolitionists for the last twelve or fifteen years with as much zeal and effect as any man in America; and who has been burnt in effigy perhaps oftener than any one else, and who is more thoroughly feared and hated by them than any man above ground. Immediately at his side sits the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Hunter) with whom I vote as frequently as with any man on this floor—a Senator whose statesmanlike qualities have made him favorably known to the whole country, and whom everybody admits to be worthy of the presidency. Looking further along, I find the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Davis) whose resolutions I have been discussing, in whose company I was defeated in 1850, when the compromise bills were passed in opposition to our views, whose services to his country in the field and in the civil councils are such as to render him eminently worthy to be presented by his State. If I look further on, I see the Senator from Tennessee, (Mr. Johnson) a native of my own State, a gentleman whose talents and energy have enabled him to overcome the greatest obstacles, and placed him in the front rank of the statesmen of the country. If I look around, I find the Senator from Oregon, (Mr. Lane) likewise a native of my own State, whose long services to his country on the field of battle and in our civil councils render him, too, eminently worthy of this position. Sir, so far from endeavoring to throw an obstacle in the way of any of these gentlemen, I would be proud to aid him. There is nothing that either of them could desire that it would not give me sincere gratification to assist them in. There is no personal or political object of theirs that I would not like to aid them in effecting; and if any one of them should receive the nomination, I want no other privilege than that of sustaining him. I am ready to march in the ranks and with those who go on foot, and wherever the struggle is hardest and the toil and danger the greatest.

Entertaining these views, I have been disposed to abstain as much as possible from the discussion of these questions, and I really hope that we shall not press them. I think no advantage can grow out of it. I greatly fear that I have occupied more of the valuable time of the Senate than I intended. I felt, however, that from me, in my position, some explanation was necessary. I think that the gentlemen on the other side of the chamber have given us a platform already. We shall have to fight them; we had better make up our minds to go into the contest, and meet them on the great issue they tender us. In ten days we shall probably have their declaration of war from Chicago, and the clash of arms will commence very soon. It is time for us to close our ranks. I am ready to fight under that flag and that standard-bearer that may be given us. I can adopt any of those platforms that were presented at Charleston. I leave all that to our political friends assembled in convention. I know that they will present a platform, and present a man less objectionable to me than the candidate on the other side. I regard them as the deadly political enemies of my section, as the enemies of the Constitution of the United States. Let us embark in the contest and fight them with closed and serried ranks

on our side. I have spoken only in behalf of the Democratic party, of the Constitution, and the country.

NOTE.

The debate was continued for many days. I offered several amendments to the series of resolutions of Mr. Davis, in the hope that they might be so changed as to allow the Democracy, both North and South, to come together on a common platform, and make a united effort to save the country from the danger that was impending.

In the course of the long struggle one of my amendments was adopted. Its language was as follows:

Resolved, That the existing condition of the Territories of the United States does not require the intervention of Congress, for the protection of property in slaves.”

The vote on this resolution, as an amendment, was yeas 26, noes 23. Its adoption was extremely distasteful to Mr. Davis and his friends, and before the subject was finally disposed of, Mr. Wilson, of Massachusetts, who, as a member of Mr. Davis' Committee on Military Affairs, was on good terms with him, was induced to move a reconsideration of the vote, by which my amendment had been adopted. Mr. Wilson was doubtless quite willing to assist in cutting the throat of the Democratic party.

On the vote to reconsider, Mr. Wilson's Republican friends refused to vote at all, and even Mr. Bigler, of Pennsylvania, did likewise, and the vote was reconsidered, and the amendment rejected. The resolutions were finally passed in such form as to complete the division and destruction of the Democratic party as a national organization. After the end of the proceedings, in the evening, I well remember that my colleague, Governor Bragg, who concurred in my views and voted as I did, both in caucus and in the Senate, though he declined to take part in the debates, as I then supposed, because averse to doing what was disagreeable to Davis and Buchanan, I well remember his saying, “Well, Clingman, you have been completely whipped out to-day.” I replied, that but for the condition into which the country was to be precipitated, I was not unwilling to have made the last fight for the integrity of the Democratic party.

The action at Baltimore consummated the destruction of the Democratic party as a national organization, Mr. Breckinridge being made the candidate of the seceders, against Mr. Douglas, who had the endorsement of a majority of the convention. The election of Mr. Lincoln was thus rendered a certainty. In view of the fact that in the previous contest, Fremont had been beaten with difficulty, and the subsequent increase of strength of the Republican party as shown in all the succeeding Northern State elections, it seems impossible to believe that any well informed man could fail to see that Lincoln's election was a certainty.

This question forces itself on the mind, Why did any one aid in producing this result unless he desired to effect a dissolution of the Union, or the abolition of slavery, or thirdly, a civil war between the North and the South? What was the motive, especially of those Democratic leaders, who assisted in destroying the party?

Mr. Buchanan was undoubtedly the most influential person, and one of the most zealous in consummating the movement. What then was his motive in assisting to destroy the party which had made him President, unless it would agree to abandon the platform on which he had been elected? Was he

then a disunionist! On the contrary, after the division had occurred, whenever it was suggested to him that disunion would be the result, he seemed shocked and recoiled from the idea with horror. Had he any other adequate motive?

After the failure of his Kansas policy, early in his administration, the course of the Washington "*Union*" satisfied me that he intended to break up the Democratic National Convention if he could do so, but none of the Senators or members to whom I then made the suggestion, could be induced to concur in the opinion. Afterwards it became more evident, that he cherished the idea that if the party convention could be broken up, then, the country would rally around him to save the Union. As no one else seemed to share with him in this view, his persistence in entertaining it, can only be accounted for upon the principle stated by Watkins Leigh, that when the idea once entered a man's brain that he was to be elected President, it was a well settled fact in physical science, that no power was known sufficiently potent, to dislodge it.

Again, Mr. Buchanan was like most timid, insincere men, very malicious, and bore an intense hatred to Douglas. Anxiety to defeat him was a most powerful motive.

It is undoubtedly true that after the developments consequent on Lincoln's election were made, he did regard disunion as inevitable, and made up his mind to accept it as the decree of fate. But at the time when he was most actively aiding the early movement in that direction, it does not seem that he was actuated by such a purpose.

Mr. Buchanan's capacity is not generally understood by the public. His failure as an executive officer causes him to be underrated in other respects. He was not only so insincere as to exemplify the remark that "Pope was so insincere that he took tea by strategem," but he was really possessed of great cunning. Intelligent, well informed, and most plausible in manner, his powers of deception were very great, and his capacity for personal intrigue was extraordinary. In addition to these qualities, he was in a position to use very dexterously and effectually the advantages which his official situation gave him. Whether the vacant Supreme Judgeship, which he held so long suspended, was potent with such men as Caleb Cushing and Daniel S. Dickinson, and thus enabled him to secure their co-operation, is a question for speculation. The very fact that no one could suppose that Mr. Buchanan, situated as he was, would favor any movement that might even remotely endanger the Union, tended to throw all men off their guard, and induced them the more readily to join in what he urged. No man ever seemed to be more earnest, industrious and indefatigable than he was, and few were more successful than he was in securing co-operation.

Senator Slidell gave a most powerful support to the movement, not only in Washington, but in Charleston, to which city he and Senator Bright went during the sitting of the convention. But I have no reason to believe that, at that period, he was seeking disunion. On the contrary, when I referred to it as a probable result of the division of the party, he repelled it, and, in fact, seemed to turn away from the idea as one not worthy of consideration. His colleague and intimate personal friend, Mr. Benjamin, said to me in the early part of the session following Lincoln's election, that he had been absent from home (in the west, I think,) at the time of the presidential election, and that on his return to New Orleans immediately after it, he was more surprised than he had perhaps ever been in his life, to see the feeling manifested among the people. He declared that the most astonishing part of it to him was that those who were regarded as the least informed, mechanics, laborers and others, termed the lower classes, were the most anxious for resistance. They

knew, in truth, that disgrace was not prudence and that the overthrow of the Constitution and the destruction of their social system could only bring upon them the greatest injury. It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Benjamin did not work for the movement with any such view.

As to Mr. Jefferson Davis, the few conversations I had with him, as well as all I heard from others, left me in doubt as to his motives. When his resolutions were first introduced, they were regarded by some as a mere effort on his part to get ahead of his colleague, Mr. Brown, as the exponent of the extreme views of Mississippi. It soon became manifest, however, that further purposes were entertained. I recollect that on a certain day in the spring, as we were walking out of the capitol grounds into Pennsylvania avenue, he appealed to me with much earnestness, to join in his movement. He had not long previously gotten a letter from some foolish man in the North, (I think it was Davis, of New York, who had written some of the Jack Downing letters) urging that the South should insist on its rights, &c. After reiterating my objections to his movement, I said: "I think, Mr. Davis, even if we all go together into the presidential fight, our adversaries will beat us, and thus give us a broad issue to go before our constituents on." He replied, with a scornful look, "It has never entered into my mind that they can beat us, whether we are united or not." When it is remembered that Fremont had nearly been elected in the preceding contest, and that the anti-slavery movement had evidently since been gaining strength, it seems singular that any one should believe that the Democratic party, divided between two candidates, would be in no danger of defeat. Even after the election, it was stated to me by Mr. Keitt and others, that Mr. Davis seemed reluctant to go with the secession movement. I, therefore, decline under all the circumstances to entertain a decided opinion as to his purposes.

Another Senator from one of the Cotton States was urging me to join them about that time. I said that if we acted together, and made it evident that we had done all in our power to protect our section in the Union, the South would unite for defense, but that, on the other hand, if it should appear that we were seeking disunion as a matter of choice, such States as North Carolina and Virginia would not join in the movement. He replied, with a haughty air: "We do not expect North Carolina and Virginia to do any of the fighting. All we desire is the right to march across your territory, to get at the yankees." Of course all argument was wasted on such persons.

That such a man as Senator Bright, living as he did in Indiana, should have desired the secession of the Southern Democracy from him, seems little more wise than the evolution of the man, who in the top of a tree, sawed off the limb on which he was standing. His course and that of such other Northern Democrats as Cushing, Dickinson and the like, seems not to be accounted for upon any of those principles, which usually influence men of intelligence. It appeared strange that such a man as ex-Senator Bayard would consent to become president of the seceders convention at Charleston. Possibly such gentlemen as these, had so much confidence in Buchanan, Davis, Slidell and others, that they, without much thought, followed them confidently. The Whigs of the South for many years, with little less folly, adhered to the Northern Whigs, who were for doing the very acts that those in the South declared would justify revolution. I have observed in war, that soldiers after a time, acquired such confidence in their officers, that they, without thinking for themselves, blindly did whatever they were ordered to do.

Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Davis and Mr. Slidell were intensely hostile to Mr. Douglas personally, while Mr. Bright had shown for some time previously, jealousy and dislike to him. The first three were men of strong feelings of

repugnance towards those that excited their hostility, and readily became bitter personal enemies. And yet it does not seem that, violent as they were, they should have been so blinded by hatred and malice, as to regard the gratification of such feelings as affording an adequate reason to justify them in deliberately seeking to destroy their party, and promote the election of such an adversary as then stood before them.

FLOYD'S DISTRIBUTION OF ARMS IN THE SOUTH.

During the summer of 1860, I happened to be in Washington, subsequently to the adjournment of Congress, and at that time some arms were sent South, and it was stated in some of the Northern papers that my visit had some connection with that transaction. In fact, I at that time had no such object in view, but as much has since been said of Secretary Floyd's sending arms to the South, a statement as to how he came to take that step may possess interest. In the latter part of November, 1859, being in Raleigh, Governor Ellis and I had a conversation in reference to the John Brown raid into Virginia, and the extraordinary manifestations of favor then extended to his enterprise. The Governor expressed his regret that there were no arms in the State for defensive purposes, and asked me to see the Secretary of War and ascertain what was the amount that might be due to North Carolina, and get her quota whatever it might be. I also think that during our conversation he said that if there were any arms in the State he would not hesitate, if an emergency occurred, to take them. I may be mistaken as to his making this last remark. I told him I would do what I could.

Accordingly, soon after reaching Washington, I called on Governor Floyd, the Secretary of War, and, after stating the case, asked him what arms he could send to our State? He said he would enquire, and immediately sent for Colonel Craig, the ordnance officer. On his coming into the room the matter was explained to him, and he was directed to ascertain what arms, under the existing laws, the State of North Carolina was entitled to have. The Secretary told me that if I would call in a few days he would have a report ready for me.

On my seeing him again, soon after, it was ascertained that not more than a few hundred stand of small arms could be sent to North Carolina under the existing law. We had a good deal of conversation on the subject of the defenceless condition of the State as well as of the South generally. At length he said: "I can do this, and have been thinking of it. There are a great many arms in the various Northern arsenals, and I can distribute them over the different States, wherever there are arsenals suitable for their preservation." I urged him to do this, and think I stated to him that this would fully answer our purpose, as we would not hesitate to take possession of them if it became necessary for defensive purposes. Subsequently he stated to me that he had ordered that twenty-eight thousand rifles, and a number of muskets, should be sent to the arsenal at Fayetteville, North Carolina, as well as a large supply to other States. In fact, it subsequently was ascertained, that nothing like this number of rifles had been sent to Fayetteville, or, as Mr. Davis, during the war, told me that Floyd had been "cheated by Colonel Craig." The larger number sent were old muskets.

The fact known to Colonel Craig that I had previously induced Mr. Davis, when in Pierce's cabinet, to send munitions of war to San Francisco, and subsequently that I had held an interview with Secretary Floyd on the subject of the latter distribution of arms in the South, doubtless led him to suppose that my journey to Washington had a connection with the forwarding arms at that time, and hence the report referred to.

But this transaction tends to show that important results follow things that are in themselves seemingly trivial. Had not Governor Ellis spoken to me on the subject of procuring arms for North Carolina, it is not probable that I should ever have spoken to the Secretary of War on the subject. And had I not seen Governor Floyd, and brought the matter urgently to his attention, it is not likely that he would have made the distribution of the arms. It was only after it was ascertained that but a small amount could be donated to the States, and in our second interview, that he announced his purpose to send the arms South.

To estimate the importance of the consequences that followed this action, let these facts be considered:

It was not until some time in the month of July, 1861, in which the battle of Manassas was fought, that the first contract was made by the Confederate authorities for the purchase of small arms, and that contract was only for six or seven thousand rifles; I say six or seven thousand because the Hon. Charles M. Conrad informed me that he had been a member of the Congressional committee to investigate the matter, and that that committee had ascertained that the first contract made had been in that month for the purchase of six thousand rifles. But, subsequently to this conversation, General Joseph E. Johnston, to whom I mentioned it, said that the number contracted for was seven thousand. Whether the one amount or the other was the exact one is not a material question, nor is it important to ascertain when these arms were delivered, if they ever were, subsequently obtained by the Confederate authorities. This circumstance is important as showing that no arms were imported by the Confederate government during the early part of the war.

In confirmation of this fact it may be stated that when I was in Montgomery, about the middle of May, 1861, as commissioner from North Carolina, General Toombs, then Secretary of State, complained of the remissness of President Davis and his Secretary of War in not having taken early steps to procure arms, but said that they had just previously moved in the matter, &c. In the early part of June following, at Richmond, the conversations I had with President Davis led me to believe that he had made engagements to obtain arms, and General Toombs again said that there must then be a large amount of arms afloat, which were intended for the Confederacy. He made this statement to me more than once. And yet, when in the early part of July, 1861, I returned to Richmond, General Toombs, with great indignation of manner, told me that he intended to resign his position as Secretary of State, because he said the President and Secretary of War had deceived him in pretending that they had made purchases of arms. He declared with the greatest emphasis, that "they had not purchased a gun," and that he would not stay in the Cabinet. On more than one occasion, previous to this, he had complained of their refusing an offer from a responsible party, who agreed to deliver, for a small price, fifty thousand Enfield rifles, to be inspected on board the ship by a British ordnance officer. The Governor of Missouri, about the first of August of that year, told me at Richmond, that he would have taken steps to obtain arms, but that he had been assured that it was unnecessary; that the Confederate government had made ample arrangements to obtain an abundant supply of arms. It is a well known fact, that volun-

teers by the hundred thousand, were, in the early part of the war, kept out of it, because there were no arms for them.

These circumstances enable us to realize the importance to the Confederacy of the movement of Secretary Floyd in sending the arms to the South. As soon as Fort Sumter was taken, fearing there might be too much delay, I telegraphed Governor Ellis to seize the Fayetteville arsenal. He did so in time to secure the arms there. A portion of them were given to the first North Carolina regiment, which fought the battle of Big Bethel, where a victory was obtained that produced a great impression on the minds of men both North and South.

At the first battle of Manassas, if the troops, which on that day carried arms from the North Carolina arsenal, had been absent, the result would most probably have been different. As I had as good an opportunity as any one else to see what occurred on that day, riding as I did over the field on a horse General Beauregard was kind enough to lend me, I have heretofore published this opinion.

Had the Virginians been prompt enough to secure the arms at Harper's Ferry, (about eighteen thousand stand) their State would have had that many additional soldiers. And had the Missourians been smart enough, instead of seizing the public buildings in St. Louis, of no value to them, to take the fifty thousand stand of arms that Floyd sent to them, the result of the war in the Mississippi Valley would probably have been very different from what it actually was. At the final surrender which took place near Greensboro, North Carolina, this conversation occurred. There were about a dozen general officers sitting together, and a remark was made somewhat disparaging to President Lincoln, whose recent death had become known. Thereupon an officer of the highest rank, and of the most undoubted abilities, said: "If we had had Lincoln and they had had Davis, we should have subjugated the North." There was silence for a few moments, and at length I remarked that in that event I had no doubt but that we should have secured our independence. He replied, instantly, "We could, during the first year of the war, have imported two millions of arms and placed a million of men in the field, and we would have subjugated the North." These statements are referred to as evidence of the importance to the Confederacy of arms, and as tending to show what great consequences often follow acts that in themselves seem of little moment.

[After the rupture at Baltimore, as the election of Lincoln seemed to be a foregone conclusion, I did not think it worth while to take any part in the contest. But Mr. Douglas, at Norfolk, in reply to some questions by Mr. Lamb, one of the Breckinridge electors, declared himself in favor of what was popularly known as the doctrine of "coercion." Being surprised that he should have taken such a position, I went to Raleigh to be present at the delivery of his expected speech. Soon after his arrival I called to see him with a view of endeavoring to induce him if possible to explain away the objectionable statement.

On my enquiring as to his prospects in the canvass, he said that he could carry great strength in the North, if he had Southern support. I expressed my surprise that he should have made such a reply as he did to Mr. Lamb at Norfolk. He said that the question had been put suddenly to him while he

was speaking, and that he had answered without time for reflection. He added that Breckinridge would have to answer the question also. I told him that Breckinridge would, I felt confident, make no committal on the subject, but that if he were to do so, as he had done, I should denounce him publicly. I stated further to Mr. Douglas that while I had till then intended to take no part in the contest, yet if he (Mr. Douglas) should, standing on the ground he had taken at Norfolk, obtain any considerable vote in the South, that fact would encourage Lincoln to resort to force, and hence I should feel it to be my duty to canvass against him, and reduce his vote as much as possible. He expressed his regret in strong terms, saying that as I had been regarded as a friend of his, my opposition would be very injurious to him. I told him that unless he could modify his position, I would have no alternative but to take ground against him. He said he would think over the matter before he spoke next day.

I then proposed to him that if he and his friends would agree that there should be but one Democratic electoral ticket in the State, with the understanding that the electors should cast the vote of the State either for himself or Breckinridge, as it might be found most advisable to defeat Lincoln, then I would induce the Breckinridge men to assent to the arrangement. I stated that they would be averse to the movement at first, but that I would notify them that I would, in case they refused, canvass the State against Breckinridge, and thus throw its vote into the hands of the Bell and Everett party, and that I had no doubt but that I could compel the Breckinridge men to agree to the arrangement. Mr. Douglas said in response, that if he were to enter into this arrangement it would lose him his strength in the North, and that, therefore, he must decline it. It subsequently turned out that the only votes he did receive in the North were two obtained in New Jersey through such an arrangement.

On the next day, during his speech he was interrupted by Colonel McRae, and asked to repeat to the audience what he had said at Norfolk. It was at once manifest that this was a concerted affair between him and Colonel McRae, and he stated, in strong terms, that if Lincoln were elected he should be inaugurated, and that all persons who might resist should be hanged as "high as Haman." He declared that this government could not be regarded as perfect in its action until it had hanged a traitor, &c. It was clear from this and certain other circumstances, that Mr. Douglas was not making the canvass with any hope of being elected himself, but to carry out the views of our adversaries in the North and divide and weaken the South as much as possible.

During the canvass in North Carolina, while I in my speeches took ground for resistance to Lincoln, my colleague, Gov. Bragg, and most of the other Breckinridge speakers declared strongly for the Union. On looking to the returns after the election, it appeared that at those points where I spoke there had been gains to the Democratic ticket on the preceding August vote, while generally at other places we lost ground as compared with the vote in the State election. There were two reasons for this, the first of which is obvious enough. In a contest made as to the comparative unionism of the two parties the Breckinridge men ought naturally to have lost ground, because all the pronounced disunionists in the South supported that ticket, and hence its friends had to struggle against the current on such an issue.

A second and more potent reason existed in the fact that the people generally felt that we had the right side of the issue against the Abolitionists, and when an appeal was made directly to their manhood, they were ready to respond properly. It was in fact owing to such feelings that the subsequent action took place.

In North Carolina, however, and in most of the Southern States, this spectacle was presented. The supporters both of the Douglas and Bell tickets charged boldly that the object of running Breckinridge was to prepare the way for a dissolution of the Union. To meet this line of argument the Breckinridge men in most localities strongly denied the charge and endeavored to surpass their opponents in declarations of devotion to the Union. It thus seemed that if "eulogies on the Union could save it," surely it was not in danger. Such a factitious sentiment in its favor was thus gotten up, and so feeble seemed the resistance feeling, that it appeared as if the South was so divided into factions, and so utterly helpless in the presence of its enemies, that nothing was left for it but unconditional submission.

This condition appeared so clearly and palpably that the bankers, merchants and other prominent men in New York, without regard to mere party feeling, united in a public address to the country, in which it was urged, that as the South was divided, distracted and helpless, then was the time for the North to unite by common consent, and compel them to submit to the government of an anti-slavery administration. In substance they declared, "Samson is now on his back, tightly bound with new withes and strong cords; now let the Philistines be upon him." But that he did burst these mighty bands, and arise in strength to meet his adversaries, is the noblest exhibition of manhood hitherto presented by the great Caucasian race, that has been placed by Providence at the head of humanity. That they subsequently failed of success was due to an executive imbecility, which was a fitting sequel to the manner in which they were precipitated into the contest, divided and without preparation.

In view of the developments that immediately followed Lincoln's election on the evening of my nomination for re-election to the Senate, on being called upon for my views, I stated to the caucus that, in my opinion, civil war was imminent, as it was ascertained that some of the States would secede, and that if the movement were confined only to the Cotton States, it was most probable that Lincoln would make war upon them, and that we should be involved. Hence I urged that North Carolina should call a convention at once, and through it take the position that, if Lincoln, instead of giving proper assurances that the rights of our section were not to be invaded, should resort to coercion against the seceding States, that in such a case we would take ground against him. I expressed the opinion that by thus laying down propositions in the nature of an ultimatum the peace of the country could be maintained.

Immediately after the meeting of Congress, as it may be seen in the *Congressional Globe*, the following debate occurred, December 4, 1860.]

A. J. Glossbrenner, Esq., the Private Secretary of the President of the United States, appeared below the bar, and said: Mr. President, I am directed by the President of the United States to deliver to the Senate a message in writing.

The Vice President, (the message having been delivered into his hands.) Is it the pleasure of the Senate that the message be now read? There being a general acquiescence, the message was read.

Mr. Clingman. Mr. President, I make the usual motion for printing the message, and I will take this occasion to offer a suggestion or two upon some of the points embraced in it.

As to the general tone of the message, Mr. President, everybody will say that it is eminently patriotic, and I agree with a great deal that is

in it; but I think it falls short of stating the case that is now before the country. It is not, for example, merely that a dangerous man has been elected to the Presidency of the United States. We know that under our complicated system that might very well occur by accident, and he be powerless; but I assert that the President elect has been elected *because he was known to be a dangerous man*. He avows the principle that is known as the "irrepressible conflict." He declares that it is the purpose of the North to make war upon my section until its social system has been destroyed, and for that he was taken up and elected. That declaration of war is dangerous, because it has been indorsed by a majority of the votes of the free States in the late election. It is this great, remarkable and dangerous fact that has filled my section with alarm and dread for the future.

The President says that he may be powerless by reason of the opposition in Congress now; but that is only a temporary relief. Everybody knows that the majority which has borne him into the Chair can control all the departments of this government. Why, sir, five or six of our conservative Senators have already to give place to others on the 4th of March; and if the others do not, it is simply because their terms have not expired. Both the Senators from Indiana and the Senator from Illinois, (Mr. Douglas) and other gentlemen, would be beaten by that same majority, if it were not that their terms have time to run. They must, however, be cut down at no distant day. Not only that; but if the House of Representatives is divided to some little extent, how long will it be so? We all know that New England has presented an unbroken front for some time past; and does any man doubt that the same organization that elected Abraham Lincoln can make a clear majority of both branches of Congress? The efforts of the Abolitionists will be directed to the few doubtful districts, and they will soon be subjected to their control. So powerful and steady is the current of their progress that it will soon overwhelm the entire North. In this way they must soon control the President, both Houses of Congress, the Supreme Court, and all the officers of the government.

The result is that a sectional party will wield the entire power over all the departments of the government. Gentlemen say they are shown by the vote to be in a minority. That is an aggravation. Under our present Federal system, it turns out that a little more than one-third of the voters may control all the departments of the government, and oppress tyrannically not only the South, but the minority at home. I take it for granted that nobody foresaw this state of things when the Constitution was made. If the Federal Constitution was out of the way, this minority could be resisted; but under the present system—and it is that that alarms the South only the more—everybody sees that there may be a sectional majority which represents a minority of the people, that may absolutely control the whole government. I would not consent for my constituents to be governed absolutely even by a sectional majority, much less by a minority. The South would be then in the condition of Ireland, represented nominally, but really as powerless as if the semblance of representation was not given to it at all.

But this is not the worse view of the case. We are not only to be

governed by a sectional domination which does not respect our rights, but by one, the guiding principle of which is hostility to the Southern States. It is that, Mr. President, that has alarmed the country; and it is idle for gentlemen to talk to us about this thing being done according to the forms of the Constitution. A majority even might begin a revolution in that way; you might totally change the whole character of the government, in fact, without abolishing its forms. The Roman Republic was in fact converted into a grinding despotism by just such a process. The most outrageous tyranny can be perpetrated under all the forms of law.

It is said, however, that some of the States are inclined to be precipitate in their preparations for resistance. I do not think so. I admit that what are called the cotton States may be precipitate as compared with my own and some other States, but if you compare their action with that of foreign States or nations that have existed heretofore you cannot so regard them. Why, sir, I say boldly that if the occurrences which have happened in this country for the last fifteen years were done by a foreign nation we should have been involved in war. If the property of an American citizen is taken by any foreign nation, and upon a demand for redress it is not given up, or paid for war follows; and if, instead, the foreign Government legislates to protect the wrong-doer, war is inevitable. Everybody knows that if the property of a Frenchman, for example, was taken in England, and the British Government, instead of making satisfaction, were to pass acts of Parliament to protect the wrong-doers, war would be inevitable.

It would be the case if the same thing occurred between any other foreign States. But we are in a vastly worse condition than would be the people of any foreign State, because those States of the Union that legislate to prevent the recapture of our property are doing it in perfect safety. The proceedings of the old Barbary Powers when they used to send out cruisers and capture property on the high seas, were manly and honorable enterprises compared with these proceedings, because they ran the risk of having their towns bombarded; and in fact, it was done by the American and British and other governments; but here in perfect safety this system of legislation goes on, and there is no redress under our system; and yet, if the State of South Carolina, or any other, proposes to act, she is reflected upon. I allude to her particularly because she has no representatives on this floor. She does not need defense from me or anybody else; and if her representatives were here I should not have even said this much. Instead of being precipitate, she and the whole South have been wonderfully patient. No free people were, I think, ever so much so.

Gentlemen say that the border States are the States that have most reason to complain, and they appeal to those South to wait longer. But, Mr. President, what has been the past history of the country in relation to this slavery question? We all know that in 1850, when there was a great struggle going on to get a fair settlement—a settlement which would have placed the South in a proper position with reference to the Territories—the border States, much to my regret, were the first

to leave us in the struggle. They abandoned the general cause of the South for the right to recover their fugitive slaves. I do not mean to say that all their representatives were willing to take this course. I know that the two Senators from Virginia, and many others, resisted that inadequate settlement; but the border States were responsible mainly for it. This fact produced distrust in the States further south, because everything seemed to have been given up for that fugitive slave law, which is now worth nothing to anybody.

Again, Mr. President, when, last winter, the State of South Carolina sent her commissioner to Virginia seeking a conference, we had not only from the Black Republican press of the North, but from the Southern Union press, a great clamor about the Union. Then Virginia was called upon not to go into "South Carolina's disunion schemes." I thought it very unfortunate then that no action was taken by the Southern States upon the question. Then it might not have been too late to avert the present dangers. That has passed by, and now the condition of South Carolina, as compared to Virginia, is just like that of two individuals, both of whom have been insulted and kicked for a long while, and one of them says, "I propose now to get out of the way;" and the other replies, "If you do all these blows will fall on me, and I want you to stand by me and divide the torrent of obloquy and castigation, so that my load may be the lighter."

I say, sir, that the people of the United States would not submit for one moment to the treatment from a foreign nation that the Southern States have suffered at the hands of the North. I have heard it suggested that the laws to which I have referred ought to be repealed. I have no doubt they ought to be. Whether they will be or not, other gentlemen can judge better than I; but the mere repeal of these laws, I am free to say, would not, in my opinion, satisfy the section from which I come; because the fugitive slave law is rendered a nullity by the action of mobs, independently of this State legislation; and if, in addition, the marshals should be Abolitionists there would be the less need of such State legislation.

The President has said that there ought to be new constitutional guarantees. I do not see how any Southern man can make propositions. We have petitioned and remonstrated for the last ten years, and to no purpose. If gentlemen on the other side have anything to propose of a decisive and satisfactory character, I have no doubt the section from which I come would be willing to hear it. I say to those gentlemen in perfect frankness that, in my judgment, not only will a number of States secede in the next sixty days, but some of the other States are holding on merely to see if proper guarantees can be obtained. We have in North Carolina only two considerable parties. The absolute submissionists are too small to be called a party; but the mass of the people consist of those who are for immediate action, and and those who are waiting for a few months to see whether any guarantees will be proposed that are sufficient to save our honor and insure our safety.

I give the opinion—gentlemen may take it for what it is worth—that unless something of that kind occurs, you will see most of the

Southern States in motion at an early day; and without undertaking to advise, I say that, unless some comprehensive plan of that kind be adopted, which shall be perfectly satisfactory, in my judgment the wisest thing this Congress can do would be to divide the public property fairly, and apportion the public debt. I say, sir—and events in the course of a few months will determine whether I am right or not—in my judgment, unless a decided constitutional guarantees are obtained at an early day, it will be best for all sections that a peaceable division of the public property should take place.

I know there are intimations that suffering will fall upon us in the South, if we secede. My people are not terrified by any such considerations. They have been governed, not by cowardice, but by a very strong attachment to the Union. They have no fears of the future if driven to rely on themselves. The Southern States have more territory than all the colonies had when they seceded from Great Britain, and a better territory. Taking its position, climate and fertility into consideration, there is not upon earth a body of territory superior to it. Everybody knows it would support a population of three hundred millions if it were as densely settled as parts of Europe, that from personal observation I know not to be superior to it. The Southern States have, too, at this day, four times the population the colonies had when the seceded from Great Britain. Their exports to the North and to foreign countries were, last year, more than three hundred million dollars; and a duty of ten per cent. upon the same amount of imports would give \$30,000,000 of revenue—twice as much as General Jackson's administration spent in its first year. Everybody can see, too, how the bringing in of \$300,000,000 of imports into the Southern ports would enliven business in our seaport towns. I have seen, with some satisfaction, also, Mr. President, that the war made upon us has benefited certain branches of industry in my State. There are manufacturing establishments in North Carolina, the proprietors of which tell me that they are making fifty per cent. annually on their whole capital, and yet cannot supply one-tenth of the demands for their productions. The result of only ten per cent. duties in excluding products from abroad, would give life and impetus to mechanical and manufacturing industry throughout the entire South. Our people understand these things, and they are not afraid of results if forced to declare independence. Indeed, I do not see why Northern Republicans should wish to continue a connection with us upon any terms. They say that our institutions are a disgrace to the political family, which they intend to remove. They declare African slavery to be a crime, and that it must be abolished. If we and they separate, their consciences will be freed from all responsibility for this sin. They want high tariffs likewise. They may put on five hundred per cent., if they choose, upon their own imports, and nobody on our side will complain. They may spend all the money they raise on railroads, or opening harbors, or any thing on earth they desire, without interference from us; and it does seem to me that if they are sincere in their views, they ought to welcome a separation.

I confess, Mr. President, that I do not know whether or not I understand the views of the message exactly on some points. There is something said in it about collecting the revenue. I fully agree with the President that there is no power or right in this government to attempt to coerce a State back into the Union; but if the State does secede, and thus becomes a foreign State, it seems to me equally clear that you have no right to collect taxes in it. It is not pretended that we can collect taxes at British or other foreign ports from commerce going in there. If a State of the Union secedes, and becomes a foreign State, it cannot be touched. The most offensive form of coercion which could be adopted would be that of levying tribute. I have no doubt that most of the governments of Europe would release their dependencies from the claim on them for protection and for postal facilities, &c., if they would just pay the government all the money it might think proper to exact. I do not know, sir, whether I am given to understand from the message that there is a purpose to continue the collection of duties in any contingency; but if that be the policy, I have no doubt some collision may occur. I deprecate it; and hope there will be none. If there is to be a separation either of a part or the whole of the slaveholding States, I think it better for all parties that it should be done peaceably and quietly; and as far as I have any influence, it will be exerted for bringing it about in that way if it must come. I do not undertake to say what my own State will do. Even if she were not inclined to move, she will soon find a movement on her southern border; and so it is with Virginia, and with all the Southern States; and in my opinion the movement will not stop until they all go. I give that opinion because this is an occasion of so much moment that no man ought to withhold his opinions. I may be wrong; but I speak on the subject frankly, just as I would converse with any gentleman by the fireside.

My purpose was not so much to make a speech as to state what I think is the great difficulty; and that is, that a man has been elected because he has been and is hostile to the South. It is this that alarms our people; and I am free to say, as I have said on the stump this summer, repeatedly, that if that election were not resisted, either now or some day not far distant, the Abolitionists would succeed in abolishing slavery all over the South.

Now, as to this idea of gentlemen waiting for overt acts. Why, sir, if the Fugitive Slave Law had been repealed without these other occurrences, it could not have produced half the excitement in the country. Men would have said, "We have gotten back very few negroes under it; its repeal merely puts us where we were ten years ago." Again, if you were to abolish slavery in this District, it would be said, "There are only a few thousand slaves here; that is a small matter; are you going to disturb this great Union just for the sake of a few thousand slaves?" It is said, however, by some persons, that we are to submit until revolution is more tolerable than the acts of which we complain. That was not the policy of our revolutionary fathers. Nobody supposes that the tea tax or the stamp tax was an oppressive measure in itself. They saw, however, that if they were submitted to, in time

oppression would be practiced; and they wisely resisted at the start.

Now, sir, I take it for granted that Lincoln would resort to no overt acts in the first instance. I cannot conceive that he would have the folly to do so. I presume he would be conservative in his declarations, and I should attach just as much weight to them as I would to the soothing words and manner of a man who wanted to mount a wild horse, and who would not, until he was safely in the saddle, apply whip or spur. I take it for granted, when he comes in, he will make things as quiet as he can make them at first. I presume the policy of the party would be to endeavor to divide the South. They complain that abolition documents are not circulated there. They wish to have an opportunity, by circulating such things as Helper's book, of arraying the non-slaveholders and poor men against the wealthy. I have no doubt that would be their leading policy, and they would be very quiet about it. They want to get up that sort of "free debate" which has been put into practice in Texas, according to the Senator from New York, for he is reported to have said in one of his speeches in the Northwest, alluding to recent disturbances, to burnings and poisonings there, that Texas was excited by "free debate." Well, sir, a Senator from Texas told me the other day that a good many of these *debaters* were hanging up by the trees in that country. I have no doubt, also, they would run off slaves faster from the border States, and perhaps oblige the slave-owners to send them down further South, so as to make some of those States free States; and then, when the South was divided to some extent, the overt acts would come, and we should have, perhaps, a hard struggle to escape destruction.

Therefore, I maintain that our true policy is to meet this issue *in limine*; and I hope it will be done. If we can maintain our personal safety, let us hold on to the present government; if not, we must take care of ourselves at all hazards. I think this is the feeling that prevails in North Carolina. I have spoken of there being two parties there, but I may say to you, Mr. President, that that party which is for immediate action, is gaining strength rapidly. I do not believe there has been a meeting yet held in the State where there was a collision of opinion, that ultra resolutions have not been adopted. This feeling is not confined to either of the political parties which made a struggle there in the late elections. The current of resistance is running rapidly over the South. It is idle for men to shut their eyes to consequences like these. If anything can be done to avert the evil, let those who have the power do it. I will not now detain the Senate longer.

Mr. Crittenden. Mr. President, I regret that the honorable Senator from North Carolina has thought proper to make the speech which he has just addressed to the Senate. I did hope that we had all come together upon this occasion duly impressed with the solemnity of the business that would devolve upon us, duly impressed with the great dangers that were impending over our country, and especially with those dangers which threaten the existence of our Union. That was the temper in which I hoped we were now assembled. I hope this debate will proceed no further. The gentleman has hardly uttered a sentiment or an opinion in which I do not disagree with him—hardly

one, sir. I have hopes of the preservation of that Union under which I have so long lived; I have hopes that that Union which was the glory of our fathers will not become the shame of their children. But I rise here now, sir, not for the purpose of making a speech, and I intend to stick to my purpose. I wish the gentleman had stuck to his when he said he rose not to make a speech. I rise here to express the hope, and that alone, that the bad example of the gentleman will not be followed, and that we shall not allow ourselves now to be involved in an angry debate. We had better not have come here at all if that is our purpose. If we have not come here to give a deliberate and a solemn consideration to the grave questions are thrust upon us, we are not fit for the places which we occupy. This Union was established by great sacrifices; this Union is worthy of great sacrifices and great concessions for its maintenance; and I trust there is not a Senator here who is not willing to yield and to compromise much in order to preserve the government and the Union of the country.

I look forward with dismay and with something like despair to the condition of this country when the Union shall be stricken down, and we shall be turned loose again to speculate on the policies and on the foundation upon which we are to establish governments. I look at it, sir, with a fear and trembling that predispose me to the most solemn considerations that I am possibly capable of feeling, to search out if it be possible, some means for the reconciliation of all the different sections and members of that Union, and see if we cannot again restore that harmony and that fraternity and that Union which once existed in this country, and which gave so much of blessing and so much of benefit to us all. I hope we shall not now engage in any irritating or angry debate. Our duties require of us very different dispositions of mind; and I trust none of us will allow ourselves to be irritated or provoked, or through any inadvertance involved in any angry or irritating discussions now. Calm consideration is demanded of us; a solemn duty is to be performed; not invectives to be pronounced; not passions to be aroused; not wrongs to be detailed and aggravated over and over again. Let us look to the future; let us look to the present only to see what are the dangers and what are remedies; and to appeal, for the adoption of these remedies, to the good feeling of every portion of this House. It is in that way only that we can arrive at a peaceable and satisfactory conclusion.

I will not now allude further to any of the questions which the gentleman has presented. I shall not discuss the question whether Mr. Lincoln's election be or be not a good cause for resistance. I tell you there is at least diversity, great diversity of opinion, which should make us regard it as a question for consideration. I do not believe there is a man in the State of Kentucky—we have parties there, we have divisions there—but I do not believe there is a man in Kentucky, of any party, that agrees with the gentleman on that question. We are all a Union-loving people, and we desire that all these dissensions may be healed, and a remedy applied to all the grievances of which we have a right to complain, and that there may be a restoration of peace and tranquility. That is what we desire. I hope, judging from

the general character of my friend from North Carolina, and judging from the noble character of the State which he represents here—a State that has always, while exhibiting the firmness that belongs properly to her, carried the olive branch in her hand constantly, and has taught peace, harmony, and union, heretofore in this country—I hope from him that, on reconsideration and calmer reflection, he will unite with us here in as true a spirit of union and devotion to the country as any man.

I am content, sir, that the gentleman's motion for printing the message shall be passed, and I will waive any remarks which I might have been disposed otherwise to make on that message. I do not agree that there is no power in the President to preserve the Union. I will say that now. If we have a Union at all, and if, as the President thinks, there is no right to secede on the part of any State, (and I agree with him in that,) I think there is a right to employ our power to preserve the Union. I do not say how we shall apply it, or under what circumstances we should apply it. I leave all that open. To say that no State has a right to secede, that it is a wrong to the Union, and yet that the Union has no right to interpose any obstacles to its succession, seems to me to be altogether contradictory.

Mr. Clingman. Mr. President, I occupy a different position towards the distinguished Senator from Kentucky from that which he occupies toward me. I approve of much that he says, though I regret, of course, that he does not agree with me on any of my points. I approve of his desire to see these questions harmoniously settled—of his wish to preserve the Union on honorable terms; but we differ as to the proper mode of doing it. It seems to me that ignoring these evils is like talking of health when a man is very ill. You must apply remedies that will reach the disease; and I have spoken, therefore, frankly my impression; and I think I shall be sustained by a vast majority of the people of my State in what I have now said. He is pleased to compliment the State, and I, as one of her representatives appreciate it. North Carolina was the last State but one to come into the Union; she hesitated a long while. I think she has shown great devotion to it; but whenever it ceases to protect her honor and provide for her safety, she will bid it farewell, though she may be reluctant to do so. The Senator no doubt knows, far better than I do, the feeling of Kentucky; but from what I have seen in all parts of the country in which I have been, I think this movement among the people will go on unless a remedy be applied.

Mr. Crittenden. It is to find that remedy that we are here.

Mr. Clingman. I think one of the wisest remarks that Mr. Calhoun ever made was, that the Union could not be saved by eulogies upon it. We have had eulogies upon the Union until they have been productive of mischief. The Abolitionists say that "the South cannot be kicked out of the Union," and Southern men say amen to it. I do not refer to the Senator; but I mean that the tone and language in the South has been calculated to encourage the Abolitionists, and render them only the more insolent and aggressive. It was, therefore, I

frankly made the declarations already uttered. I will join the honorable Senator, in good faith, in an effort to avert the evil that threatens us, if any fair prospect should be presented. Failing in this I will stand by my State in any effort she may find necessary to protect her interest and maintain her honor.

ANDREW JOHNSON.

At the time when Congress met such were the manifestations in the South that it seemed not improbable that most, if not all of the slaveholding States would secede. This prospect produced a profound impression upon the Northern mind and induced the Republicans to consider the best means of counteracting the movement. On meeting Senator Collamer, of Vermont, he said to me in a very kind manner, "You must let us know your terms, for we do not want to part with you." A prominent member of the House from New York said, "I have no doubt but that Kentucky and the whole South will go." The desire for a settlement seemed general among the Northern members. Mr. Crittenden moved with a view of settling the difficulties. His propositions were regarded with much favor. Even Mr. Toombs and Mr. Davis said that if his plan were adopted it would be satisfactory. The desire for settlement on some such basis seemed to pervade the minds of a majority of the Northern Senators.

The first check to this movement was caused by a speech of Andrew Johnson, in the Senate, delivered on the 18th and 19th of December. It is doubtful if in the history of the world there have been many speeches more effective in their consequences. This, however, was not at all owing to the contents of the speech itself. On the contrary, the effort was rather a collection of commonplace matters, and was, in fact, a mere repetition of newspaper articles of former years against secession, old campaign speeches and arguments, with all such things as were best calculated to revive old prejudices against South Carolina, &c. He insisted that force should be used against the people of the States, whether they were unanimous in seceding or not, just as General Washington had put down the whiskey insurrection in Pennsylvania. He quoted whatever he could lay his hands on that seemed best calculated to get up the strongest feeling of opposition against the Southern movement generally, &c. In his manner he was unusually vehement and vindictive, and especially denunciatory of "compromises."

The effect of the speech was, on the contrary, entirely due to the position and character of the speaker. The Senators all knew that he was a man not at all accustomed to give any attention to the public business of the country generally, except so far as he might hope to turn something to his personal advantage. In fact, they knew that he was, as a public man, governed mainly by one single principle, and that was "Andrew Johnsonism." Though they regarded him as a selfish demagogue, yet at the same time, they knew that he was a very cunning one. They felt confident that he did not *intend* to be on the unpopular side of any important question, and they looked upon him as a good judge of what would be popular. There was among them a general conviction that he would not have taken such a position unless he felt confident that he would be sustained at home. In fact, most persons regarded him as a very good judge of popular feeling, and the earnestness with which

he spoke made it evident that he expected to be sustained by a majority of the people of the South, and in the end be on the winning side. Consequently there was at once manifested an entire change in the feelings of the Northern Senators. It was evident that they intended to pause for a time and see how far his position would be endorsed in the South.

Johnson was in several respects a peculiar, if not a remarkable man, in his qualities and career. The fact that it was generally understood that he had not enjoyed the advantages of an early education, caused men to estimate his efforts greatly above their intrinsic value. His voice and manner were rather disagreeable, and in his speeches themselves there was little original or striking. In fact, they were mainly made up of extracts and the opinions of others collected with care. He never acquired readiness enough as a speaker to take part in the running debates, but his replies were only made after many days preparation.

Persons occasionally praise his messages while President, without noticing the differences between his first message, which reminds one so much of Mr. Seward, and a powerful later one, which was popularly attributed to the pen Judge Black.

Johnson, however, possessed great industry, energy and perseverance, but the driving forces of his mind were selfishness, envy and malice. He was eminently of the class that Dr. Johnson would have denominated "a good hater." On one occasion Wm. T. Haskell, a brilliant member from Tennessee, was describing certain persons, and among them mentioned his colleague, Andrew Johnson. "He is," said he, "a man that if you and he happened, while travelling on opposite going railroad trains, to meet at a wayside hotel to eat a hasty meal, and if he should look across the table and see that the piece of bread by your plate was larger than his, he would hate you as long as he lived." Though this remark was an exaggeration, yet as caricatures often do, it illustrates a prominent feature.

Even Johnson's speeches for the Union were not so much characterized by love for it, as hatred of its enemies. During the earlier period of his service in Congress his speeches contained attacks on West Point as an aristocratic institution. After the Mexican war had rendered West Point popular, he changed his batteries and leveled them against the Smithsonian Institution; and after the new wings of the Capitol were erected, he assailed their costliness.

While he disliked all those who seemed to have any advantage over him, he was rather kind to those below him. Persons best acquainted with him say he was the reverse of liberal where his own means were to be used. His efforts for the "landless," as manifested in his homestead speeches have been mentioned as evidence of his benevolence. If so, however, it was the same kind of benevolence which in the latter days of the Roman Republic caused ambitious men to distribute the public money among the populace, and which in modern times induces candidates on the morning of the election to set out "liberal treats."

It is singular that Johnson should so frequently be spoken of in the papers as "honest." I cannot recollect that any President from Washington to Buchanan, inclusive, was ever commended especially for his honesty. Men no more thought of calling them honest than they do of saying that a lady in respectable American society is virtuous. In fact, it would have seemed rather an insult to one of the earlier Presidents to raise a question as to whether he would have improperly taken money. The circumstance that it was the subject of remark that Johnson would not improperly take money, or receive bribes, shows how much latterly opinions have changed with respect to public men.

Some of Johnson's declarations publicly made confirm certain statements of his friends, that his purpose after his return to the Senate was to advocate the repudiation of the entire public debt of the United States upon the ground that the bondholders had already received, in the form of interest, more than they had originally given to the government. If he held this position, his ideas of honesty were limited to a narrow standard certainly. A statement made by General Grant in his testimony before a committee of the Senate, places Mr. Johnson in a still worse light. General Grant testified that after the surrender of the Confederates, President Johnson repeatedly expressed a wish to arrest, try by court martial and execute General Lee and other Confederate officers, and that Johnson, on his denying the right of such a proceeding, impatiently asked when the time would come when this could be done. As General Grant's evidence was made public, and neither Johnson nor any of his friends attempted, as far as I know, any denial or explanation, there seems no reason to question the accuracy of General Grant's statement.

When it is remembered that in the beginning of the war the United States deliberately decided not to regard the Confederates as "*rebels*," but treated them as "*belligerents*," and exchanged prisoners with them, and that they had been paroled upon the express stipulation that as long as they obeyed the laws of the United States they should be protected in person and property, is it to be supposed that Johnson was really stupid enough to believe that the United States would be justified in treating these men as criminals, to be executed under the sentence of a court martial? And if he was not so stupid, was he so blinded by malice, or so anxious to secure the applause of the extreme men of the North, as to disregard all the principles of common justice among men? His twenty thousand dollar clause, and his repeated and earnest declarations against traitors in the early part of his presidency seemed to favor the latter idea.

There has been a good deal of speculation as to his change of position towards the close of the first year of his administration. When his previous conduct and character are considered the explanation does not seem difficult. Though Johnson's perceptions were by no means quick, yet after a time he did see, that in spite of his efforts to satisfy the views of the body of the Republican party in the North, he had failed to do so. He realized the fact that they had taken him up for the Vice-Presidency merely to aid their own purposes, and that however willing they might be to make use of him, they neither respected him nor intended to trust him further. As a selfish, ambitious man he resented this, and at once sought to be revenged on them, and at the same time advance himself. Nothing was more natural, therefore, than that he should be willing to make favor with their opponents, even though they might be men whom he so vehemently denounced as aristocrats and rebels.

A story of Scotch history is mentioned to this effect. When, during the civil wars of Scotland, Bruce was fighting under the banner of King Edward, in one of the battles, while fighting under the eye of the King, Bruce distinguished himself by his valor, and by slaughtering divers of the enemy. When, after the victory was won, they were all assembled at the King's dinner table, Edward observed that Bruce had not taken time to wash his hands, and said in an undertone to one near him, "Look at that d----d Scot; see how he eats the blood of his countrymen." Subsequently this remark was mentioned to Bruce, and in the next battle he fought so differently that when again they met at the dinner table, Edward said, "My lord, you eat with clean hands to-day." If Johnson had possessed Bruce's talent, or even

average administrative abilities, with courage, he might in 1866 have won a victory as decided as that of Bannockburn.

It may be remembered that in 1856 Mr. Fillmore, at Albany, said in a speech, (I quote from memory, but substantially): "It would be folly and madness to suppose that our Southern brethren would consent to be governed by such a chief magistrate as Fremont. If the matter were reversed we would not submit for one moment, and if you think our Southern brethren are not as sensitive and as tenacious of their honor as we are you are mistaken."

This speech expresses the feeling of the higher toned Northern men, and hence they have more respect for Confederates than they have for Southern Union men. Even those who lived in the border States, which did not secede, because the contest was in fact urged against all the slaveholding States, are not held in as much favor as those residing in the old free States. Boutwell's declaration that no man, who had been for the last seventy years brought up under the shadow of slavery, could praise the Union without being a hypocrite, was the expression of a sentiment that underlies the feelings of all the extreme anti-slavery men in the North.

It must be admitted that Johnson probably did as much to cause the war as any one man, and was entitled to the thanks of those who profited by it, however little credit they may give to his motives. His course, too, shows how much a man of only average intellect may be able to accomplish by devoting his powers industriously and energetically to the promotion of his own advancement.

PRESIDENT BUCHANAN.

With the progress of the session Mr. Buchanan's position became more and more perplexing. He had early, it seemed, arrived at the conclusion that the dissolution of the Union was a settled thing, and that under the decree of fate he was its last President. As evidence of the condition of his mind, this occurrence may be worth repeating. About the middle of December, I had occasion to see the Secretary of the Interior on some official business. On my entering the room, Mr. Thompson said to me, "Clingman, I am glad you have called, for I intended presently to go up to the Senate to see you. I have been appointed a commissioner by the State of Mississippi to go down to North Carolina to get your State to secede, and I wished to talk with you about your Legislature before I start down in the morning to Raleigh, and to learn what you think of my chance of success." I said to him, "I did not know that you had resigned." He answered, "Oh, no, I have not resigned." "Then," I replied, "I suppose you resign in the morning." "No," he answered, "I do not intend to resign, for Mr. Buchanan wished us all to hold on, and go out with him on the fourth of March." "But," said I, "does Mr. Buchanan know for what purpose you are going to North Carolina?" "Certainly," he said "he knows my object." Being surprised by this statement, I told Mr. Thompson that Mr. Buchanan was probably so much perplexed by his situation that he had not fully considered the matter, and that as he was already involved in difficulty, we ought not to add to his burdens; and then suggested to Mr. Thompson that he had better see Mr. Buchanan again, and by way of inducing him to think the matter over, mention what I had been saying to him. Mr. Thompson said, "Well, I can do so, but I think he fully understands it."

In the evening I met Mr. Thompson at a small social party, and as soon as I approached him, he said, "I knew I could not be mistaken. I told Mr. Buchanan all you said, and he told me that he wished me to go, and hoped I might succeed." I could not help exclaiming, "Was there ever before any potentate who sent out his own cabinet ministers to excite an insurrection against his government!" The fact that Mr. Thompson did go on the errand, and had a public reception before the Legislature, and returned to his position in the cabinet, is known, but this incident serves to recall it. During that session I saw little of Mr. Buchanan, but I was satisfied from the statements of those most intimate with him, that he regarded the dissolution of the Union as a settled matter.

Anderson's seizure of Fort Sumter suddenly involved him in great perplexity and distress. Of course it was demanded of him that he should restore the status, as he had been pledged to preserve it. The clique who had aided him in breaking up the Democratic party, the leaders of which were Messrs. Slidell, Davis & Co., were especially urgent on him to order back Anderson. Though he admitted the obligation, he was afraid to comply. Keitt said to me, "When we urge him, the old fellow almost cries, and says if he does it they will burn his house in Wheatland." After keeping him for awhile thus in the greatest torture, finding that their efforts to move him were unavailing, they abandoned and denounced him in terms of extreme bitterness. When the Southern members left the Cabinet he found a partial relief by leaning further towards the North.

GENERAL SCOTT.

During the winter General Scott came to Washington. Notwithstanding my opposition to him as a presidential candidate, our relations were cordial, and he seemed only to remember my speeches in his defense, when he was persecuted by Polk and Marey, while in Mexico.

Finding his card one evening on my return from the Senate, I called to see him at Wormley's. Our interview lasted for an hour or more, and he expressed his views at length on the situation. He said that he was in favor of merely blockading the seceding States, and thus starving them into submission. He declared with much confidence that he knew exactly their present situation, and that they then had only enough provisions to last them for six weeks. But, he added, that in spite of any blockade the government could keep up, they would by means of the Mississippi river, obtain provisions enough to last them until June, and that then they would be compelled to submit. He said, however, "I am not going to let the North have its way entirely. I think the North has been a little in the wrong in this matter, and I shall say to them you must let the South have the Missouri compromise back again."

It seemed very singular then that General Scott should not have known that the Southern States, as a whole, produced a larger amount of provisions than the Northern ones did. In fact, it was afterwards made manifest that with a large part of their able bodied men engaged in war, it was necessary that the Federal armies should destroy as much of the provisions as possible.

General Scott also went on to state that as the excitement of fighting kept up rebellion, if he were permitted to direct the councils of the United States, there should be no fighting on land. He even said that he would abandon

Washington City rather than fight, and retreat North in the expectation that the rebellion, for want of excitement, would thus die out of itself. At that particular time he seemed to share in such views as Mr. Seward expressed in his speech, when he said that in a few years after the eccentric secession movements had run their course, he was in favor of having a convention called. He, as well as some others, seemed to believe that the South, like the prodigal son, would after a while return for shelter to the Union. It was so often asserted in Northern papers that the South would perish if the North did not support it, that he and General Scott seemed singularly enough to have fallen into the delusion.

To counteract such impressions, if possible, and impress men with the idea that the war once begun would not be confined within such narrow limits, but must become a great one, the following speech was made:]

SPEECH

ON THE STATE OF THE UNION, DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEBRUARY 4, 1861.

The Senate having under consideration the motion to print extra copies of the President's message, transmitting the resolutions of the Legislature of Virginia—

Mr. CLINGMAN said:

MR. PRESIDENT: After the very interesting occurrence which has just taken place, it is difficult for me to address the Senate as I would wish to do. It is not my purpose, to-day, to attempt anything like an elaborate speech upon the questions that have been so much debated. The whole country so thoroughly understands them, that that is now unnecessary. I shall rather direct my remarks to some of the practical questions which are daily presented, for the phase of things is constantly changing, and new issues are continually coming up. The message of the President is commendable in its spirit and temper, whatever gentlemen may think of its specific recommendations.

I have, myself, regularly voted with the honorable Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Crittenden) for his proposition to compromise existing difficulties; and I shall continue to vote for any measure that may improve the existing *status*, whether it, in my judgment, be all that the South is entitled to ask or not, leaving to my constituents and other Southern States the right to determine how far it satisfies them. But I have felt all the time, that unless some movement came from the other side of the chamber, or was at least taken up by them, any effort on our part would be futile. Even though every Democratic member should vote for a proposition, and that should chance to make a majority, yet we could not here pass a proposition for an amendment to the Constitution by the necessary two-thirds vote, nor carry any proposition through the House of Representatives, much less cause its adoption by the free States.

The whole country looked to the speech of the honorable Senator from New York (Mr. Seward) made some two weeks since, in the hope

that it might present a basis for adjustment. Though that speech was conciliatory in its tone, in its practical recommendations it failed to meet, I am sorry to say, the anticipations of the people of the South. I understood him only to say, in substance, that he was willing, in the first place, to provide that slavery never should be interfered with in the States, a point about which no great anxiety is felt at this time; next, that he was willing that that provision of the Constitution which relates to the return of fugitive slaves should be made a permanent and irrevocable one; (that is a provision which heretofore has been, in fact, very inefficient.) But, upon the great question of the territories, I understood him to say that he would be disposed to vote for the proposition of the honorable Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Rice) provided there were a repeal of the existing organic laws, if it were not that the proposition of that Senator, making arrangements for the future division of the States, was, in his judgment, unconstitutional; and if that division did not take place, the mischief would be greater than that under which we now labor.

In other words—and I do not wish to do injustice to the Senator from New York—I understood him to state three formidable objections to that proposition. First, requiring the repeal of the organic laws, by which I presume, he meant that the New Mexican slave code should be repealed; and even if this were done, there stood a constitutional objection which he cannot get over, and if it were modified so as to provide that these States are to be permanent, then he holds they will be so vast that they will bring greater mischief on the country than it is already laboring under. Upon other points, I do the Senator the justice to say that he eulogized the Union handsomely, and showed that it might be productive of great mischief to dissolve it; and he also declared that, after this eccentric secession movement had come to an end, one, two or three years hence, he would be disposed to see a convention called to amend the Constitution. It struck me that the position of the honorable Senator on the present crisis was like that of a man who, when a city was on fire and the flames were spreading far and wide, instead of advising means to stop the fire immediately, should enter into an elaborate speech upon the inexpediency and mischief of having a city burnt, and suggests that when the heat and fury of the conflagration had come to an end, it might be well to have an assemblage of the people and see if there could not be made some provision to prevent similar evils.

Mr. Seward. The honorable Senator from North Carolina in endeavoring to state my positions, has perhaps come as near to accuracy as one standing in his position would be apt to understand them. If he will allow me, I wish barely to correct him in one or two points. I require the repeal, not of the laws of New Mexico, but of all the organic laws of all the Territories of the United States that were to be created into States, according to the proposition of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Rice) to organize States. I then stated that I did not see how provision could constitutionally be made at this time which would secure a proper subdivision of two such vast States at proper times, and that it seemed to me the embarrassments that would result if this were

not done would be as great as the advantages to be derived from adopting the measure. There is not much misunderstanding about that.

When the honorable Senator says I suggested a national convention, he means to state the proposition fairly, but gives it the effect of a proposition for a national convention one, two, or three years after these secession movements could have been arrested. So I understood him. What I said was, when these erratic movements of secession or dissolution shall have been arrested one year, two years, or three years hence; that is, whenever arrested within one year, and supposing that the disunionists might require more than one, I stated two, three, just so long—meaning just so long as the seceding States should require, before being ready to go into convention—as that, I could wait in order to have a proper consultation whether any of the States have such grievances as required relief by amendments of the Constitution.

Mr. Clingman. Mr. President, I am very happy to afford the honorable Senator from New York an opportunity of making this explanation. I did not greatly misunderstand his position, though I may not have been felicitous in stating it. My purpose was to call the attention of the honorable Senator to the present emergency, with a view of showing him that the remedy which he indicated would not reach the case. I greatly fear, sir, that the Senator from New York, and gentlemen on that side of the Chamber, if they are candid in stating their impressions, and I do not question their candor—altogether misunderstand the nature of this movement. Before speaking directly to those points to which I wish to call the attention of Senators, if they will pardon me, I will endeavor to state, in as few plain sentences as I can command, what I deem it to be that is now operating on the mind of the Southern States, and driving them into resistance.

The honorable Senator from New York, in one of his speeches last fall in the Northwest, said that the government of the United States had been, in 1820, diverted from its former course, and thrown into a wrong direction; in other words, that, for forty years past, it was moving upon an improper track, and that its course was now to be essentially changed. Well, sir, during that time our government has been administered by Monroe and John Quincy Adams, by Jackson and Van Buren, by Harrison and Tyler, by Polk and Taylor, and by Fillmore, Pearce and Buchanan. During these forty years, therefore, administered in that way, the honorable Senator and those who act with him hold that the government has been wrong, and they now propose to reverse its action. Wrong in what respect? Why, in admitting, by the act of 1820, that the Southern States were entitled to go with their property into a portion of the public territory. The whole purpose, as I understand it, and as the people of the South understand it, of this Republican movement is to produce a new condition of things. They say, in effect, "you of the South are not to have the influence or the privileges of the government that you heretofore had." It cannot be pretended that, during this period, we have had an undue power over the administration, for the presidential office has been fairly divided between the sections; and for the last twelve years, during which the

sectional troubles have been aggravated, it has been entirely in the hands of Northern men. I say that the whole purport of the movement, as understood at the South, is this: "Your institutions are not equal to ours, and you must accept an inferior position under the government." I am free to say, sir, even if they menaced us with no practical wrong, in my judgment, such a policy would justify resistance; for I know of no nation, no community, that ever consented to accept an inferior position, without, in the end, being ruined.

But the practical measures which these gentlemen propose are, in my judgment, in the highest degree dangerous. Look, Mr. President, over the Southern country, and ask yourself what would be the greatest injury that could be done to it? It would not be the establishment of a monarchy, or a military despotism, because we know that monarchies and military despotisms often afford a high degree of security and civil liberty to those subject to them. The greatest possible injury would be to liberate the slaves, and leave them as free negroes in those communities. It is sometimes said that they are worth \$4,000,000,000 in money. This, I suppose, is true; but that is only a portion of the pecuniary loss, if we are deprived of them. In the North, for example, if the horses and working cattle were removed, in addition to this loss, other property, such as vehicles and working utensils, the lands themselves would be rendered valueless to a great extent; and so, in fact, if you were to liberate the slaves of the South, so great would be the loss that financial ruin would be inevitable. And yet, sir, this is not the greatest evil. It is that social destruction of society by infusing into it a large free negro population that is most dreaded. Northern gentlemen may realize the evil, perhaps, by considering this case, which I put to them. The negroes of the South are, in most of the States, worth more than the lands. Suppose there was a proposition now to abolish the land titles through the free States, that, if adopted, would produce immense mischief; but, in addition, suppose there were to be transferred to those States a free negro population, equal to half their own, or, as they have eighteen million of people, turn loose among them a population equal to nine million free blacks, and that accompanied with the destruction of the land titles and abolition of the landed property; would not the people of those States at once rise in rebellion against such measures?

The British newspapers seem to be at a loss to account for the excitement and revolution prevailing in this country. It is very natural that they should not understand it, because they draw their ideas altogether from opinions expressed in the North, which are unjust to our section, and partly, also, from the condition of things prevailing in Europe. There, revolutions do not occur, except from extreme physical suffering. The consequence was, that Great Britain, before our Revolution, could not understand that our people would make a revolution upon what Mr. Webster declared was a mere preamble—a mere assertion of the right of Great Britain to tax us; and they never did realize, until the war had actually begun, that we would fight merely to escape a contemptible tea-tax of three cents a pound. So, seeing that the United States is one of the most prosperous countries on the earth,

they do not seem to realize the idea that we should go to war upon a mere question of right, before actual suffering had begun. Now, Mr. President, our slave property exceeds the national debt of England in value. How long could a ministry stand that was for the abolition of that national debt? Remember, too, that the population of the British Isles is three times as great as ours; and it would have to be increased three-fold to make the losses there proportionately as great as those the abolition of slavery would inflict upon us.

But again, sir, this is only a partial statement of the case.

In England they are very hostile to a Catholic monarch. If there were a Catholic monarch on the throne, it might produce a revolution. But suppose England were united with a country like France, greater in population; and that that country had the power to impose a Catholic monarch on England against the wish and feeling of the entire body of the people in the British Isles; and that it was known that monarch favored the abolition of the national debt; does any man doubt that the British Isles would be in a blaze of revolution? And yet, sir, that is not as strong a case as that which is now presented to the South.

I am told, however, by gentlemen, with a great deal of seeming plausibility, that this is a condition of things that cannot be carried out; that, though Mr. Lincoln may have said that the war must never cease until slavery is abolished, and that he hoped during his lifetime to see this result produced, yet, under the existing Constitution, he will not be able to effect it; and we are told that we ought to wait, at least, for overt acts. Now, sir, when an honorable Senator tells me, for example, that he stands upon the Georgia platform, and that he is ready to resist its violation, I give him credit for the utmost sincerity; but I tell you, Mr. President, as a Kentuckian, as one who represents a conservative and border State, I do not believe, if we submitted now to this election, that those overt acts would be resisted. Take, for example, the Fugitive Slave Law. If it were repealed twelve months hence, it might be said that this law violated grossly Northern sentiment; that it was very inefficient; that we did not recover more slaves under it than we did under the old law; that we would be simply thrown back to where we were in 1850; that the border States, being those most interested, ought to be the first to move, and no resistance would in fact be made.

Secondly. Suppose the Wilmot proviso, or the exclusion of slavery from the Territories, was adopted: It would be said, that this was what had been often done; it had been repeatedly passed, and even sanctioned by Southern men, and that in fact slavery never would go into the Territories; that this right was a mere abstraction, and the question would be asked, "Will you dissolve the glorious Union for a mere abstraction?" I do not think there would be resistance by the Southern people after they had been demoralized by submission to Lincoln.

Thirdly. Suppose slavery were abolished in this district, it would doubtless be done with compensation to the owners. The people of the North would not object, of course, to paying a small amount for

that purpose, and those who are favorable to a high tariff might be very willing to make that expenditure. Even now, sir, the leading Republican journals are discussing the propriety of buying all the slaves in Maryland, in your State, sir, and in Missouri and Delaware, and thereby making them free. This proposition finds favor. If, therefore, slavery in this district were abolished in that way, it would be said, "what right has South Carolina, or North Carolina, or any other State to object?" While these things were going on, you would see a division to some extent created in the South. There are, in all communities, discontented elements; there are everywhere men who are ready for a change and ripe for revolution. So powerful is this element in most countries in the world, the people have to be kept down by force. There is, perhaps, not a country in Europe where there would not be a revolution every ten years if it were not for the arms and power of the government. But when a government undertakes to foment revolution, it is omnipotent; and I have no doubt that, with all the patronage and all the power which a Republican President could bring to his aid, with a free post-office distribution of abolition pamphlets, you would see a powerful division in portions of the South. In the meantime, the forts and arsenals could all be well occupied and strengthened, and all the public arms removed from the Southern States. Last winter, before these difficulties happened, when Mr. Floyd made an order directing the removal of arms from the Northern to the Southern States, though he removed less than half of them, he was vehemently denounced for it. You are too well read in history not to remember that Carthage was destroyed because she permitted the Romans, under a promise of good treatment, to remove all her public arms; and if the South, in that condition, with additional armaments in all the forts, with some division among our people, and threatened with negro insurrection, and deprived of all share in the public arms, were then to resist more serious aggressions, we should fight under great disadvantages, and, perhaps, if not subdued, have a long and bloody struggle before us.

I say, therefore, to the honorable Senator from Kentucky, in all sincerity, that, in my judgment, the issue which his State and mine have to determine is, whether there shall be a manly resistance now, or whether our States shall become free negro communities. It is my deliberate judgment that, if this issue had met with no resistance, the latter alternative would have been the result. But, sir, six States have resisted, and are out of the Union, and the seventh, Texas, has probably gone out during the past week. There are causes in operation which will inevitably, too, if they are not arrested, drive out other slave States. In North Carolina, in Kentucky, and in Virginia, for example, a large number of the people now are waiting to see if there can be any proper adjustment. If it fails—if some such scheme as the honorable Senator from Kentucky has offered, is not adopted, a large and powerful body of conservative men will at once go to the side of the secessionists. Even if that does not carry out those States, there is one other contingency, urgent and pressing, which will do it. Your State, sir, has determined, by an almost unanimous vote of her Legis-

lature—and so has Virginia—that any attempt to coerce the seceding States should be resisted by force. True, gentlemen say they are not for coercion, but they are for enforcing the laws and collecting the revenue. I will not enter into an argument to prove to any Senator that this is coercion. If I were met on the highway by a man, with a pistol in hand, and he should say that he had no right to rob me, but that he meant to take my money, and would use force to accomplish his purpose, I should not enter into an argument with that man to convince him that this was robbery. So, when honorable Senators tell me that they are for enforcing the laws, I will not argue that this is coercion. All that Great Britain ever demanded in the Revolution was, that the colonies should obey the acts of Parliament, and pay such taxes as she imposed; and there was no day, during that long struggle, when, if George Washington and his compatriots had agreed to pay the taxes and obey the acts of Parliament, that the British armies would not have been withdrawn.

This is the only sort of coercion that is ever used among civilized nations. Great Britain, France, Russia, or any other civilized country does not send out armies to shoot down peaceable, obedient men. All they require is, that the laws should be obeyed and the taxes paid. This idea of sending armies to kill people who are obedient prevails only among savages. It is done in Africa, where one negro community turns out and destroys another. It was the mode of enforcement used among the aborigines of this country, when one Indian tribe went out and destroyed another. Therefore, when honorable Senators tell me that they are not for coercion, but they are for enforcing the laws, I understand them as simply saying that they are civilized men, and mean to resort to that process which prevails in civilized nations, and not among savages.

They suppose, Mr. President, that they will be able to have a little war; and I have been astonished, in conversing even with Senators, to say nothing of the newspapers, to find that the idea prevailed that you could have a small war, confined to the blockading of a few ports, and that it would stop there. At an early day of this session, my attention was called to a plan, coming from a distinguished source, in which the opinion was maintained that there were not at that time, in several of the planting States, provisions enough to support the people for two months; and that certainly, with all they could get, by June they would be starved out and brought to terms of submission by a simple blockading of their ports. I was astonished that such an idea should have been entertained in the quarter from which it came. Why, sir, everybody familiar with the South knows that those States have ample means of living until the next crop is produced.

If you could enforce a strict blockade, there is no country on the earth that it would injure so little as the South. All that is made in the United States can be produced there in the greatest abundance, as far as agriculture is concerned, and we might manufacture everything on earth that is needed; and if the whole cotton crop were detained at home, it would not, in a material degree, affect our ultimate prosperity. I say that, if the \$200,000,000 worth of cotton which is

annually sent from the slave States, were kept there, or never produced, we might still be one of the most prosperous countries on earth; but how would it be with Europe and the North? Can they do without cotton?

It was said, boastingly, at an early stage of the session, that King Cotton was dethroned. There never was a time when that monarch seemed to be, in fact, so powerful. When this panic began, and all other kinds of property fell, cotton rose rapidly. The monarch had but to waive his scepter and the bankers of Europe opened their coffers and sent a stream of gold across the Atlantic in ships such as old Neptune never saw when his trident ruled the Mediterranean. Neptune's power was limited to the sea. Alexander claimed to have conquered the world; but his dominions were confined to Asia and the territories on the shores of the Bosphorous. Julius Caesar, a still mightier monarch, ruled only on the eastern continent. King Cotton governs two hemispheres, and dominates on land and sea, and the kings of the east and the merchant princes of the west obey his bidding. Most fortunate was it for New York and the North that his power was unbroken; for when the panic was progressing everywhere, and the banks were failing, and traders were being ruined, and New York itself was staggering and likely to go down with the mercantile interest of that section, producing wide-spread misery, it was this stream of gold which came from Europe that upheld the New York banks, and enabled them to sustain the merchants, and prevented a scene of ruin such as we have not hitherto seen. Suppose New York had lost that gold; suppose the cotton which her ships were engaged in carrying had gone out in foreign vessels directly to Europe—above all, sir, suppose it were kept at home, and that neither the North nor England could obtain it; you would see such a commercial revulsion, such a panic, such a pressure, as has not been known in a century. Things would indeed look as if Chaos had returned to assert his ancient dominion over the world. I find a short extract in one of the British papers, the *London Chronicle*, of January 18, which comes to me in the newspapers this morning, that illustrates the view that they are now taking in England of this danger:

“The question is, in fact, little short of life and death. Ruin to merchants and mill-owners, and starvation to the rest of the population, hang immediately in the balance. One year's failure of the American crop, or postponement of the American supply, would produce calamities worse than any war or famine within modern experience.”

That is the statement of a British organ, not at all friendly to us and our institutions. The southern coast is too extensive to be actually blockaded by the greatest naval Power on earth; and do you think Great Britain and France would regard a mere paper blockade? You know they would not; they could not afford to do it; and it would never be effective if attempted. Again, sir, as was said by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Slidell) this morning, the whole ocean would swarm with privateers, and the northern shipowners would find them-

selves deprived of our freights, and also liable to capture on the high seas. But, I ask, does anybody suppose that the war would stop there? Does anybody suppose for one moment that the people of the South would sit down quietly and be cooped up in that way? No, sir. They would march until they found an enemy on land; and with two thousand miles of frontier, stretching from the Atlantic to the extreme West, does anybody really suppose they would not find vulnerable points? I ask gentlemen what is to prevent an attack upon this capital? This city could be destroyed by an army that did not cross the Potomac. A shell could be thrown from Virginia into this very Senate Chamber. I do not say this by way of menace; but to let gentlemen see that there is no difficulty in finding points of collision; and lest I should be supposed to insinuate that there is on foot a plan to attack this capital, I wish to disclaim emphatically all purpose of any design to interfere with it as far as I know or believe. This capital is not of the smallest consequence in a military point of view. It was said by a great commander that, as to fortified places and cities, he would leave them to the end of the war; for they were the prizes which fall to the conqueror. This is eminently true of this District. It is obliged to follow the fate of the territory around it. Though the whole South were anxious that a northern government should be kept here, if Maryland and Virginia, or Virginia alone should leave the Union, we all know that the North would not find it to be to its interest to keep a capital either surrounded by foreign territory or on its border. I should regret deeply any struggle for a place like this, which is of no value in a military point of view, and which would impel the country into civil war; but I am free to say, that if a war begins down in the South, it is as likely to come up here as to any other point that I know of. It cannot be confined to Charleston harbor; it cannot be confined to Pensacola; but when it begins there, it will find its way perhaps to this very city.

Gentlemen will see that, with these two thousand miles of frontier, it is practicable to have war, and it would certainly occur, a regular old-fashioned war, if the present line of policy be continued. There can be no doubt about it. It is so clear to any gentlemen who reflects, that I do not think it necessary to enlarge upon it. But it is sometimes said that, if a war begins, the North, being the more powerful of the two sections, will certainly be able to overrun the South. Mr. President, there are a million and a half of men in the slaveholding States capable of bearing arms; and it is generally supposed that a country can maintain permanently in the field one-sixth of its able-bodied men. That calculation would afford two hundred and fifty thousand men for a fighting force. You must recollect, however, that among our four million slaves there are at least two million laborers. This circumstance would largely increase the force we could keep in the field. I have no doubt that a million of men at home, with all the slaves, would carry on our industrial occupations, while we might have at least four or five hundred thousand men capable of being kept in the field. Such a force would certainly require an immense sum

of money to maintain it; but a community struggling for existence will not count the cost of armaments.

How will it be in the North? You ought to have a larger force than this to enable you to carry on war abroad. Suppose it is no larger: how are you to keep in the field a body of four hundred thousand or five hundred thousand men? At the outset, I grant that your bankers might come forward, and enable you to begin the war on credit; but all wars of any length cannot be maintained in that way. The exports of the free States are generally less than one hundred millions; and your imports can be no greater, without draining you of specie. Any tariff you can impose will give no more money than you will want to support your Government in time of peace. I put this matter to gentlemen seriously, because it is well enough to look at these things now; for in a few weeks we may have them upon us as actual realities. I ask Senators to exercise no greater foresight than any farmer manifests when, in the spring of the year, he provides for the coming autumn and winter. These issues may be upon us in a few weeks.

Now, do you believe that you can get your people to consent to support an enormous system of taxation for the mere purpose of subjugating us? From the very nature of your population, your industrial occupations must suffer more than ours. A large portion of your people are engaged in commerce, and others in manufactures; and they depend partly upon us for freights, and partly, also, for markets. Deprived of these you must have a large, idle, discontented, and suffering class. There is, besides, a still greater difficulty to be encountered before you. A large portion of your people believe that you are wrong in this movement.

When, Mr. President, the war broke out in America, Lord Chatham, said, on the floor of the British Parliament:

"I rejoice that America has resisted; three million people so dead to all sense of shame as to consent to become slaves would soon become the instrument of making slaves of us all."

You will find hundreds and thousands of men rising up in the North and holding this language, and refusing a cordial support to your war measures. After, perhaps, a long, expensive, and bloody war, a peace would be made, leaving the two sections widely separated in feeling. When the peace of 1783 was made with Great Britain these States would have united with any civilized power on earth sooner than with her; and you may make, by such an attempt, a permanent separation and lasting enmity.

I say, then, Mr. President, that one of three contingencies is inevitable before you: either a settlement of these difficulties such a satisfactory and arrest the movement; or a recognition of a peaceable separation; or thirdly, war. No human ingenuity can find any other result. The best course, undoubtedly, would be to adjust things now, if possible, on a satisfactory and permanent basis. The next best is a peaceable recognition of the independence of the seceding States; and

the worst of all, but inevitable, if neither of the others be taken, is war. I tell gentlemen, if they sit still war will make itself; it will come of its own accord. Look now at the condition of the forts in the South. They were originally built, mainly to protect those States in which they are situated, as a portion of the Union, but there were some additional reasons for their erection. When States secede, the government is entitled to be paid for its property, undoubtedly; but the States have a moral and political right to occupy, and they will hold those fortifications in the end. I may say, in relation to the manner in which they came to be taken, something by way of explanation. On the last day of December, there were orders issued from the War Department, for the purpose of sending troops South. It is true, that late in the evening, perhaps as late as eleven o'clock, these orders were countermanded; but in the meantime, telegraphic despatches were sent to the South, and a number of forts were taken. In my own State, on the day following, the 1st of January, we were advised there was a similar movement on foot, and a dispatch went down which prevented it, by giving assurances that the orders had been countermanded. Not long afterwards, however, the sending down of the Star of the West occurred, other reports of hostile movements went abroad, and our own people occupied some of the forts in North Carolina; but they were informed again that there was no purpose on the part of the government to reinforce them, and they were abandoned.

I mention this in order that Senators may understand the *animus* of our people. They do not want to interfere with the government property; they do not mean to interfere with its rights while it may be disposed to do them justice; but they do not intend that these forts shall be used for their oppression. Of what use is Fort Sumter to the government of the United States unless it be to vex and harass Charleston? If things remain as they are now, with the understanding that these places are to be held by the government, or retaken, of course you will have war; it is obliged to come on. And this question presents itself to honorable Senators: had you rather have this war; or do you prefer doing something to avoid it? If you let things remain as they are, until Mr. Lincoln comes into power, with the well understood purpose of holding the forts in the South, to compel those States to pay taxes to, and obey the laws of, what is now a foreign government, you leave them no alternative but to take those forts by force. I repeat, if under these circumstances you stand still, all the world will know that you mean to have war.

I am sorry to see, Mr. President, that many on the other side, instead of meeting these questions as I think they ought to do, are laboring under strange delusions. When Senators—I refer particularly to the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Davis,) who has left, and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Hunter)—spoke of the evils of war, and deprecated them, it was trumpeted far and wide through the North that the South was afraid of the result, and was begging for peace. There never was a greater mistake. I have yet to see the first Southern man who believes that his section could be conquered; but in speaking of the evils of war, these gentlemen show that they have

counted the cost of the enterprise, and are willing to hazard all its consequences.

But another and still greater delusion under which I think Republicans are laboring is, that a Southern Confederacy would not be recognized by the great Powers of the earth. Do they not know that it is a well-settled principle to recognize *de facto* governments? Oh, yes; but they suppose that the humanity of Great Britain will prevent her recognizing a slaveholding community. Let us look a little to the acts of that government. Its humanity did not prevent its waging war with China to compel the Chinese to take opium for the benefit of her India colonists. She is just now concluding a war with China; and one of the very objects—if the newspapers are to be relied on—to be effected, is the right to take coolies from China, and transport them to the British Colonies. Remember, that China had earnestly resisted the seizure of her people by British agents, and done all in her power to suppress this trade in the bodies of her subjects.

Of this coolie trade I need not speak. Everybody knows that it is vastly more inhuman than the slave trade was in its worst days; that the proportion of Chinamen who are destroyed in Cuba, and other countries to which they are sent, is vastly greater than that of Africans who perish under the slave trade, and in the countries to which they are carried; but yet, if the papers are to be relied upon, Great Britain is improving on the old coolie traffic; and instead of holding them to labor eight years, she is going to work them for twenty years. Eight years was sufficient to destroy three-fourths of them, I think; and they are now going to try it for twenty years; and my friend from Missouri, (Mr. Polk) suggests that she makes them pay their own passage back. That is, she will take Chinamen, bring them to her colonies to work for twenty years, and then let them pay their passage home, if they survive till that time.

I do not say these things with any view of creating ill feeling against Great Britain; but look at her line of policy. Her humanity does not prevent her allowing the enforcement of the collection of rents in India by torture. A commission of the British Parliament has shown that thousands of Indian people were tortured to death by the most infernal devices that the wit of man ever imagined; yet that does not stop, because they say they cannot collect the rent without resorting to this mode, and their Indian empire would be valueless. Great Britain's hatred of slavery does not prevent her recognizing Turkey, a country where they hold slaves of all races and all colors. In fact, Great Britain went to war with Russia to prevent the destruction of that very slaveholding government.

But it is supposed that Great Britain has such a sympathy and friendship for the North, and that there is such a feeling upon this slavery question, that she would not recognize a revolting slaveholding Southern confederacy. Great Britain and Portugal had been on the most friendly terms for a century. Little Portugal was a *protégé* of Great Britain, and Great Britain took many a fight on her hands for her sake. She loved her like an orphan child; but her love for Portugal did not prevent her recognizing Brazil, when that country

revolted and established its independence. England and Brazil (the greatest slaveholding country in the world except our own, are now on terms of the closest friendship.

But Senators will, perhaps, tell me that she has abolished slavery in Jamaica and the West Indies. It would be an old story for me to argue that that was a political movement. However, just to refresh the minds of Senators, let me read a short extract from what Sir Robert Peel said in 1841; for what was said twenty years ago is likely to be a reality now. In the debate on the sugar duties he said:

“It was impossible to look to the discussions in the United States of America, and especially to the conflicts between the Northern and Southern States, without seeing that slavery in that nation stood upon a precarious footing”

That was his view in 1841; and in less than twelve months after, you find him making this declaration:

“That the £20,000,000 sterling expended in the West India emancipation would be well repaid by the effect the abolition of slavery would have in the United States, Cuba and Brazil.”

These declarations explain the policy which dictated the West India emancipation. Now, Mr. President, I beg gentlemen not to be deluded by all they see in the English papers. There is, no doubt, a great deal of ignorance in England about this country. I read the other day, and have read it again and again in the English papers, that the plantations at the South were all mortgaged to the North; and that the negroes and lands were, in fact, owned by the North, and if it were not that the North supplied the means, no cotton could be made. Any opinion of British papers founded on such delusions as these is not worth much to any body. But I do say there is now a great deal of intelligence among the well informed in England in relation to our country, and they evidently understand things far better now than they did formerly.

Suppose, then, it was the purpose of Great Britain, as it was intimated by Sir Robert Peel, to make use of this anti-slavery movement with a view of breaking down slavery in the United States, or causing a dissolution of the Union; gentlemen may ask me what motive Great Britain has to desire such a result. I think she has at least four powerful reasons, any one of which of itself might be sufficient to direct her action. Her great rival on the seas now is the United States. The North furnishes the ships, and the South the freights. I may say to gentlemen that, among those freights furnished by the North, there is not a great deal of bulk. The gold of California could be carried in a small ship; and the manufactures of the North take up a little space; but the cotton, the tobacco, the rice, the naval stores, and, in part, the breadstuffs of the South, mainly furnishes the freights for the immense Northern shipping. Suppose Great Britain can succeed in dividing your ships from our freights; it reduces America com-

paratively to a small maritime Power. That is one powerful motive. A second one is this: Great Britain is seeking to carry her manufactures into all the countries of the world. They are now kept out of the South by this tariff of twenty and thirty per cent., because the North has that advantage; but if the South becomes independent, British goods and Northern goods come to us exactly upon the same terms; and I saw enough of prices in Europe, a little more than a year ago, to know that our Northern friends will find their industry very much supplanted by an equal tariff between their goods and those of Great Britain and other countries. While the South would be a great gainer by this operation, as well as England, the North will lose immensely.

But there is a third motive which would naturally operate on the British government, and to some extent on others. The United States has now over thirty millions people. In twenty-five years we shall probably have more than sixty millions. If the Union continues, in fifty years from this day we ought to have one hundred and twenty millions. We certainly shall have more than a hundred millions. We will be a Power so great that we might control civilization; and it is very natural that an ambitious nation like Great Britain should be willing to cut that power down. We would do the same thing, perhaps, in a similar position.

But, Mr. President, there is a fourth reason which operates on her. It is well known that republican ideas and liberal principles are making great progress in Europe; and the governing classes, the privileged classes there, are struggling against them. The division of this Union would throw back liberal ideas for ten years, perhaps twenty—God only knows how long—in Europe. These four powerful motives may operate upon the British government, and induce those especially interested in its success as at present organized, to regard a dissolution of the Union of these States as eminently advantageous.

Now, suppose that a certain class—I do not pretend that the whole people are so—but suppose sagacious persons in Europe wished to produce this result: what would they do? They know that the North is very sensitive to British opinion, while the South is not at all so. The South, they know, will march forward with its own ideas and views, without regard to what may be said in England; but the North being sensitive to its opinion, what more natural than that the London Post, which is understood to be Lord Palmerston's organ, should come out in article after article, telling the North, if they now give way, they will be utterly disgraced; that the United States will be held in contempt by the world if they make any concessions to the slave power? This is ingenious flattery to the anti slavery feeling of the Republican party. I recollect, Mr. President, in my boyish days, reading in the *Pilgrim's Progress* of a certain black man who wore a very white robe, who met the two Pilgrims, and with fair speeches invited them to accompany him. They soon found themselves entrapped and caught in a net; and then the white robe fell off the shoulders of the black man. Has it never occurred to Senators on the other side that there may be a mistake in all their calculations? As a confirmation of this

suggestion, namely, that these British organs may change their tone after the result has been effected, I will ask the Secretary to read an extract which I find in the London Times of the 18th of January, which came to me in the mail this morning, and which shows that they now at least understood pretty well the condition of things in this country. The Times, I need not remark, is the best exponent of British opinion, and I think fully and fairly represents British feelings and British prejudices, as it is undoubtedly the ablest paper in the world. I ask the Secretary to read that extract.

The Secretary read, as follows:

"If South Carolina secedes; if Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana follow; if a Southern federation be formed, and takes its place among the Powers of the earth, there can be no hope of keeping the border slave States. These will be drawn by a natural affinity to detach themselves from the North and join the slaveholding federation. North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Missouri, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, will then be dissociated from the free States. Such an event cannot be regarded without dismay by the most staunch Abolitionist. It would, in fact, make the Southern federation the real United States, as far as territory, present and prospective, is concerned, and reduces the North to what our ancestors would have called a 'rump.' The people of Boston or Philadelphia might be distinguished for their ability and enterprise, but they would belong to a country with hardly a greater future than Canada. Every natural advantage would be on the side of the slave States. Look at the map, and you will see what a narrow slip of country composes the free soil of the American federation. Only the sea-coast from the British frontier to the Delaware—a few hundred miles—belongs to it; all the rest, stretching far away down the Atlantic and along the Gulf of Mexico, is in the hands of the slave owners. The mouth of the Mississippi, is theirs; the Missouri and Arkansas, the great arteries of the extreme West, are theirs. Virginia pushes a spur of territory to within less than a hundred miles of Lake Erie, and thus divides the Atlantic free States from the West in a manner highly dangerous to their future union. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the connection between New York and New England on the one hand, and Illinois and the neighboring States on the other, could long survive the total separation of the South. The North would have a territory as straggling as that of Prussia, and the western region would soon find it advantageous to dissolve its union with the eastern.

"In the meantime, all the riches of the New World would be in the grasp of the Southerners. Instead of exploring the inhospitable regions in the neighborhood of the British frontier, which would be all that remained to the North, the slave owners would carry their 'undeniable property' into lands blessed with every advantage of climate, soil and mineral wealth. Texas has territory enough to make three or four great States. New Mexico is about to be admitted with slave institutions. Arizona will follow. Mexico must in a few years be conquered, and the Southerners, lords of the most magnificent domain in the world, would control the passage between the two oceans. In short, if the Union lets South Carolina go, there is no saying what may go with it. It is very well to speculate on the return of an erring sister, but experience shows that secessions, when once made are not easily recalled. It is the nature of cracks to widen, and both at the North and West there are masses of people so earnest in the advocacy of strong measures to prevent a disruption that the President may be forced into active measures. For our

own part, whatever opinions Americans may have of English policy, we beg to assure them that in this country there is only one wish—that the Union may survive this terrible trial. Should Providence decree it otherwise, we earnestly pray that the separation may be an amicable one. Civil war in a flourishing country and among a kindred people, can never be contemplated without horror by a nation like ours; and we trust that neither the violence of the people nor the weakness of their leaders will bring this calamity on the American Union.”

Mr. Clingman. Mr. President, I think that illustrates pretty well the line of argument which I have been endeavoring to make, that Senators on the other side of the chamber will find themselves wholly mistaken if they imagine that Great Britain and France will not recognize us. In addition to all those reasons which would justify the recognition of countries generally, is the absolute necessity they are under of having cotton from us.

Another mistake which I think gentlemen make is this: they suppose this movement at the South may be the mere result of the efforts of designing politicians; and that the break up at Charleston has caused it. No one was more averse than myself to seeing this separation of the Democratic party; and I thank the honorable Senator from Ohio (Mr. Pugh) for his efforts on that occasion, and those of all others, to prevent it. But, sir, so far from its contributing to this secession movement, it has been the main obstacle in its way. The great body of the people of the South do not hate the North, I think, as has been said by some Senators. I know it is not true in North Carolina. There is a very great distrust of the dominant majority of the North, and an apprehension of mischief; but the great body of our people would far prefer a union with the North upon honorable terms. While this is true, however, it is equally well known that the division of the Democratic party has retarded the action of the South in defence of its honor and its rights.

I say, to you, sir, that but for this division of the party, if we had however, been beaten, the whole South would have gone out just as South Carolina has done—I mean without division. It was that party division and the discussion growing out of it, and the charges and crimination and recrimination of Union and disunion in the canvass, that were the great obstacles in the way. But our people are gradually getting over those prejudices; and they see that the Republicans of the North intended to beat us, whether we were united or not; and the very men who most regretted the divisions of the party are gradually falling into the movement. They see we will be ruined by submission to the election of Mr. Lincoln. The Republicans meant to beat us, whether we were united or not, and the injury from their rule is the same either way; and it is not for them to say that we fought the battle unskillfully. I admit we did fight unskillfully; but everybody in the South was against them. We say that their domination is just as mischievous to us as if we had been well united. Another fact presents itself, that they have a clear, large, overwhelming majority in the northern States; enough to give them the control

of the Government; and it is a knowledge of this fact that is driving our people forward, and they will gradually come up to one line of action. History reproduces itself; human nature is the same; and it might have been said in our struggle with Great Britain that the colonies were divided. They did not defend themselves well. Gates, by his rashness, incurred the defeat at Camden. There were dissensions in the colonies, and even many Tories among them; but that was no excuse for Great Britain. She intended to subdue them, whether they were united or not, and the injury of her domination would have been the same in either event.

Again: it is said, very plausibly, I admit, that we ought not to abandon our Northern friends, our allies. That identical remark might have been made, and was, in substance, made, during our Revolution, for there were Chatham and Burke and others whom our colonies had to abandon. Lord Chatham never justified, but always condemned, the secession of the colonies; but that secession or revolution vindicated him and Burke and Fox. And, sir, if we were now to submit, where would our Northern allies be? Trampled under foot by a resistless anti-slavery party. It would be said: "Your Southern friends are gasconading braggarts; ready to submit to us like whipped spaniels." They would be trodden down and annihilated; but by our resisting we vindicate the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Pugh) as a patriot, a sagacious statesman, and a just man. We vindicate the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Douglas;) the Senators from Indiana; the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Lane;) the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. Bigler) and New Jersey (Mr. Thompson;) and last though not least, the generous Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Rice.) They will stand in after times as men who had the sagacity to see the right, and the courage to defend it.

Again: we are told that having gone into the contest, we are bound to submit to the result, just as a gambler who plays a game must pay the stakes he loses. Why, Mr. President, on this principle, if the Republicans were to nominate a free negro, I suppose we ought to let him be elected without opposition, for if we run a candidate against him, we would be bound to submit to him if elected, and therefore ought to let him go in without opposition. If we had not attempted to defeat Lincoln, in fact, by running a rival candidate, we might have been obliged to submit, and ought to have been, and would have been, justly held responsible. We, however, did our duty to the country by making an honest effort to defeat him, though possibly we may not have conducted the contest skillfully. I maintain that no party in the South is justly chargeable with Lincoln's election, as, in spite of their resistance, he obtained a large majority over all opposition in States enough in the North to elect him.

I will say in candor also to Senators, that there are three measures now passing which will add very much to the secession movement in the South. I allude, first, to the Pacific railroad bill, by which we have undertaken, as far as this Senate can undertake anything, to build three railroads, at a cost of \$120,000,000. Now, sir, some of our people deny your right to make improvements. Those who admit

the right, doubt very much whether you ought to go to the expense of making a single railroad across a thousand miles of desert and uninhabited country; and this proposition for building three railroads, under these circumstances, and incurring a debt, perhaps to be increased to two or three hundred millions, (for the best informed men say it cannot fall below \$300,000,000,) will drive many of the most sagacious and reflective men of the South, men of philosophical minds, to acquiesce in dissolution.

Again, sir, here is this tariff bill, likely to be adopted, which passed the House by a large vote, containing most iniquitous provisions for the benefit of particular classes; and then there is another measure which, with due respect to those who endorse it, to my mind, is the most indefensible of all propositions hitherto advocated—I mean the homestead bill. The idea of giving up the public property by wholesale at any time to men, many of whom are the least meritorious of the community, is wholly indefensible, in my judgment; but now, with a bankrupt Treasury, borrowing money at the rate of fifty or sixty million a year, the policy of giving up these public lands in a body, to any one who chooses to take them, shocks the whole community.

Recollect that, with the sum already authorized to be borrowed at this session, the bills from the House now before us, and which it is understood are sure to be passed here, make a sum total of \$70,000,000. This does not include the \$121,000,000 for the Pacific railroads, and, in addition, we are to have this most oppressive tariff bill to tax the country outrageously, while the pending homestead bill gives the public property to the “landless.”

Our people are coming to the conclusion that this government has become so vast that it is an impracticable one. I am not sure of this. I think, large as the country is, that the government might be well administered, but for the anti-slavery excitement. When a family is divided into two sections, who are warring against each other, of course household duties must be neglected. We have had a struggle for the last ten years; the North pressing, and the South struggling for its honor and safety against the movement; and such measures are its results. In fact they are directly traceable to that hostility of Northern anti-slavery men. Why, sir, the people of the Northwest do not want high protective tariffs—by no means; and many Republicans do not want them; and yet you find the Republicans in a body, in the House and on this floor, coming up and voting for a most enormous tariff. Why? It is to secure the support of the tariff-men of Pennsylvania and elsewhere.

Again, sir, New England does not like this homestead bill. At any rate, when I came here fifteen years ago, I found the men from New England were in favor of holding on to the public lands, and so far from wishing to encourage settlement in the West, they used to object strenuously to opening that territory to take off their laborers from them. They wished to retain them at home and thus keep down the price of wages. Now you find the solid vote of New England, I believe, for the homestead bill to tempt their people to go away. Why is this?

They want to satisfy the West; and you find the northwestern Republicans going for this high protective tariff to secure the votes of Pennsylvania and the East. The anti-slavery men form the great nucleus of the party, and they spread out their arms in all directions and gather in allies.

Now, I am free to say, Mr. President, if, when this homestead bill was up, I could substitute for it a proposition giving the lands absolutely to the new States in which they lie, I would prefer it. It is a less evil to the government. If they choose to give them out to the landless, let them do it. I would in that way, if I could, cut them loose from this combination. In the same way, sir, if you present to me a well-guarded Pacific railroad bill for a single track, I will vote it through, if it is on the cheapest and best line; but if you ask me to tax my people outrageously to benefit a few manufacturing capitalists, I will not do it. What I desire, then, is this: we should, even if this Government is to endure, dissolve this combination. Remember, sir, the South has no share in this copartnership. The Northeast is to get the tariff; the Northwest the Pacific railroad and the homestead bill; and the Republicans, or Abolitionists, are to get anti-slavery. These are the parties to the combination. The sagacious men of the South see the danger; and sooner than submit to be cheated and plundered in this mode, with the prospect in the future of the abolition of slavery and the utter destruction of their section, they are coming resolutely into the struggle. Nor will they pause now unless full justice be done them on this slavery question. The Legislature of my own State, as well as that of Virginia has planted itself firmly on the basis of the Crittenden propositions, with certain additions, and they will not be satisfied with less.

I am astonished that the North hesitates to take the proposition of the honorable Senator from Kentucky. What is it? Why, of the existing territory, it gives the South about one-fifth and the North four-fifths. We are entitled to have two-fifths according to population. They say it is carrying out the platform on which Mr. Breckinridge was nominated; I allude to the presidential candidate. All that is a mistake. By that platform, as they understand it, slavery was to be protected in all the Territories; and the people of the South honestly believe that it ought to be so, and that, according to the true intent of the Constitution, it is protected; and the opinions of the Supreme Court sustain this view. Now, instead of carrying it out, that proposition proposes to give the North four-fifths of the territory, and only one-fifth to the South. Why, sir, a man who claims a tract of land, and offers, as a compromise, to give up four-fifths of it, would not obtain his claim, certainly. It seems to me, therefore, the Republicans ought not hesitate one moment, but ought at once to have taken it.

They say, however, that their platform requires that they shall have the whole of the territory, and exclude us altogether. I submit to honorable Senators as just men, (for I know that in the ordinary transactions of life they are just men,) that there is not a Senator on that side of the Chamber that does not know that the South has con-

tributed its money fairly with the North; that in every war we have turned out more than our proportion of men; and I ask them if it is just that our people should altogether be excluded from those acquisitions which we jointly made?

But some of them object to that provision which applies it to future Territories. They say we will take Mexico, Central America, &c. Why, Mr. President, if none of the States had seceded, the North would have a majority now of eight Senators on this floor. With all the States represented in the other branch, she has fifty-seven majority, and under the incoming apportionment will have over sixty. They know that no territory can be ever acquired without a large support from them; and the new States of the Northwest coming in will very soon swell still more their majorities. It is idle, therefore, for these gentlemen to try to convince any one that they are afraid of acquisitions against their wishes. No, sir; I apprehend that they want to keep this question open. I fear they want to have materials to electioneer at home, and put down those men who are just enough to recognize our right. I fear that they want to keep it an open question, by which they can crush out such Northern Democrats as my friend from Ohio. If not, why object to settling the whole territorial question for all time to come?

Again, sir; why not agree that slavery shall be protected in the District of Columbia, the forts and arsenals in the slave States, and to the slave trade between the States? They can do that without interfering with any Northern interest. If they do that—if they place this entire question where it cannot be reached, you may, perhaps, end this agitation; otherwise it cannot be ended; and, for the sake of our Northern friends, I think we ought now to take a stand and leave the Union at once, unless a complete adjustment can be made.

Ten years ago, Mr. President, I became apprehensive that we should have a dissolution of the Union between these States. Up to that time I had not thought it possible. I think there was a great error committed then. I have always regretted that Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster, patriotic as they were, did not seem to appreciate the magnitude of the question, and did not place that settlement on its proper ground. If that Missouri line had been run through, as was demanded by the South, (and if they had gone for it it could have been done,) possibly we should have had peace. Nay, more: after it was determined that we should try non-intervention, I earnestly endeavored to induce them to repeal the Missouri restriction, and let non-intervention apply to Kansas and all the territory north of the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$. If they had done that at that time, we should have avoided the excitement and discussion growing out of the application of the principle to Kansas, and possibly we might have had peace. But ever since then, looking to the future, I have had apprehensions; and in examining the map of America I have often been brought to the conclusion that it seemed as if Providence had marked out on it two great empires—one lying on the Mississippi and around the Gulf of Mexico; the other upon the basin of the St. Lawrence. We know, Mr. President, that natural boundaries control very much the form of nations. A great and pow-

erful force sometimes carries a nationality over boundaries ; but nature conquers in the end. Italy has extended itself into France and Spain, and France and Spain have each extended themselves into Italy ; but the Alps and the Pyrennees still stand as the boundaries of those empires.

Now, sir, there are States which lie partly upon the waters of the Mississippi, and partly upon the St. Lawrence. Which empire they will go with, if this division occurs, is a matter of speculation. Whether they will be divided, I know not ; but it would seem that political feeling is now tending to such a division. The section nearest the St. Lawrence is anti-slavery strongly, while in the southern borders of those States there are opposite sentiments. It would seem, sir, as if the political, and the social feelings of the Northern and Southern sections of the Union were drifting in the direction of the flow of these immense rivers, and that future nationalities were to have their forms determined by these natural divisions.

Mr. President, we have had thirteen Presidents of the United States elected by the people. I mean Mr. Buchanan is the thirteenth man thus chosen who has presided over all the States. At the time the Confederacy was formed, was it written in the book of fate that it should endure until there had been a man elected for each of those States ? Senators on the other side of this Chamber will determine that question.

The honorable Senator from New York spoke with regret of a division of the Union when the dome of this capital was almost completed. The tower of Babel was not finished when the nations of antiquity were divided. There was a providential purpose in that movement—to humble the pride of man, and extend humanity over the eastern continent. Whether there is such a purpose now, by dividing this Union, to send two streams of civilization over America, or whether this unfinished tower is to stand as a monument of human folly and dissension upon a continent strewn far and wide with the immense ruins of a gigantic political and social fabric, time alone can disclose. If evil should happen, the finger of history will fix the responsibility on those who commenced and carried out this anti-slavery revolution. When Julius Cæsar looked over the field of Pharsalia, and saw it strewn with the bodies of his slain countrymen, he exclaimed, “They would have it so.” Posterity will say of those who persist in this warfare, “You would have these results.”

The most impressive ceremony, Mr. President, which I have witnessed in this Chamber was on the occasion when a number of Senators from the seceding States took leave of us. It reminded me of the funeral ceremonies when a Senator has died, but was far more impressive, because the annunciation of the death of a State of this Confederacy is more momentous than that of its representative. I use the term, because there is an analogy between the cases. When a Senator dies, his spirit goes from one state of existence to another ; it may be a brighter and a better one. When those States no longer live to this Government, they pass into a new Confederacy. The Israelites, with wailing and lamentation, deplored the loss of one of their tribes.

When recently the annunciation of the departure of a single State was made here, it was met with strange levity on the other side of the Chamber. How will it be, sir, when the ten tribes have gone, when fifteen States have departed? In those States were born and nourished such slaveholders as Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Henry and Marshall and Jackson and Clay and Calhoun. They are filled at this day with such slaveholders and "poor whites," as our non-slave owners are stigmatized by abolition speakers, as formerly went up with George Washington to defend Massachusetts and New York and Pennsylvania and the Jerseys, and, at a later day, stood upon the Canada line with Forsyth and Scott and Harrison and Johnson. When pressed by a formidable foe, the North did not refuse the aid of these southern "barbarians." If it has now grown to be so great that it regards a further association with them an incumbrance or a disgrace, then for the sake of past recollections, why not let them go in peace?

The Senator from New York said on one occasion, not long since, that, in this dispute between the North and the South, it was a matter of conscience with the North, while with the South it was only a matter of interest; and therefore the South ought to yield. By this mode, the conscience of the North can be relieved without subjecting the South to financial bankruptcy, political degradation and social ruin. The anti-slavery current can then run its course unchecked and untrammelled. It has already demanded, at Boston, the removal of the statue of Daniel Webster because he was willing to compromise with the South. How long will it be until it reaches that stage when it will require that the statues of such slaveholders as Washington and Jackson shall be thrown into the Potomac, the monument of the former razed to the ground, and the very name of this city changed to one in harmony with the anti-slavery feeling? Hereafter, if the North should meet adverse fortune, and again change its views, then there might be a reunion and a reconstruction of the government. Twice did the Plebeians secede, and twice did the haughty Patricians make such terms of conciliation as rendered Rome the foremost empire upon earth.

If the States were now divided into two confederacies, and their interests required a union, I do not know why it might not occur. But war places an impassable gulf between them. A Roman ambassador, addressing those to whom he was sent, said: "I carry in my bosom peace and war; which will you have?" Reversing his declaration, I say to Senators on the other side of this Chamber, "You carry in your bosoms, for the country, peace or war; which do you mean to give it?" If you say war, then our people will meet you, and struggle with you all along the lines, and wherever else you come; and they will defend their honor and the safety of their wives and children, with the same spirit and resolution which was exhibited at Sullivan's Island and at King's Mountain, at Yorktown and at New Orleans, and over the many battle-fields of Mexico. I have no doubt that the South will make a triumphal defence if assailed; but sooner than submit to disgrace and degradation, she would, if fall she must, rather go down

like the strong man of the Bible, carrying with her the main pillars of the edifice, the edifice itself, and the lords of the Philistines, into one common ruin.

APPENDIX.

[The following was added to the pamphlet edition issued two or three days after the delivery of the speech :]

Since the delivery and publication of the above speech, an arrival from Europe brings additional evidences of the current of British opinion on the new condition of things to be presented immediately. The views I have suggested are being confirmed, at an earlier period than was anticipated, though there was no reason to doubt but that such would be the case as soon as the dissolution of the Union should be regarded as a settled thing. I present extracts from several of the leading British journals.

From the London Times, Jan. 22.

“There is not an hour to be lost in providing against this tremendous danger. To put the case in the mildest form, three-fourths of our cotton supply has become uncertain, one-third of our trade is in jeopardy, and the earnings of one-sixth of our population may be rendered precarious. Are not these facts enough to set us at work with a will?”

In the two last issues of the paper, which is regarded as the peculiar organ of the British Premier, Lord Palmerston, the following views are presented :

From the London Post, Jan. 21.

“England is now threatened with a great danger in two forms, one immediate, the other not very distant, *and that danger concerns not only the national prosperity, but the very existence of something like five millions of the population.* The first form is that, in the existing state of things in the southern States of North America, civil war or servile insurrection may prevent the cotton crop being sown in March or gathered in September. The second is, that as soon as the Southern Confederacy has consolidated itself it may revive the slave trade, and thereby throw difficulties in the way of our obtaining cotton from it as before.”

From the London Post, Jan. 22.

“That there is imminent danger of civil war in America can no longer be doubted. We sincerely trust that the peril which now threatens may pass away, but we cannot shut our eyes to its existence, and we cannot but contemplate with apprehension the consequences which a contest between the northern and southern States is likely to entail upon ourselves. *It is notorious that upon one article of American produce millions are dependent in this country for their daily bread.* It is true that we now get cotton in considerable quantities both from India and from Africa, and in both those quarters the production of this great article of commerce is fast increasing, and is likely to increase. But India wants

railroads and Africa wants capital for the extension of cotton cultivation, and until these wants are supplied we must practically remain dependent upon our imports from the United States. *What would be result if these imports were suddenly cut off, or even largely diminished?* Such contingencies are, we fear, but too probable in the event of a civil war in America."

The subject of the recognition of the Southern Confederacy is elaborately discussed and considered in the *London Economist*, a paper representing the views of Manchester, and the manufacturing interests especially.

From the London Economist.

"We last week promised our readers that we would take the earliest opportunity of considering the bearing of the dissolution of the American Republic on the interests of our country, both political and commercial. We will suppose that matters will go on as they have begun; that the other slave States will join South Carolina, and that a Southern Slaveholding Confederation will be formed as an independent nation, prepared to enter into relations with other States.

"The first question that arises is, 'will England recognize the independence and sovereignty of the new State?' The natural spontaneous answer is, of course, in the affirmative. Our principle is, and has long been, to recognize, and to enter into amicable relations with all *de facto* States and Governments. The moment the severance is complete and admitted, we have no concern either with antecedent causes or proceedings. But here a difficulty arises. What *is* our actual relation to the new Republic? Is the whole Union dissolved, or has there merely been a separation of a portion of it? Are our treaties and engagements with *both* sections of the Union dissolved, by the dissolution of the Union itself?—or do they still hold with the North, as with the original body with which they were made? Do the Southern States, in seceding, still remain bound by the engagements entered into by the Confederation of which they formed a part at the date of those engagements? Or will they hold themselves liberated from all foreign contracts by the same act which has severed them from their domestic connection." * * *

"The real, immediate, *practical* problem that lies across our path is this: 'Will the Southern Confederate States consider themselves bound by those mutual engagements as to abstinence from and suppression of the slave trade, entered into and still subsisting between the United States and Great Britain? Probably not, since one of their chief motives for seceding is to be able to renew the slave trade. If they hold themselves freed, we do not know how we can bind them, or make them regard themselves as bound. But supposing our diplomacy were able to obtain this point, the only consequence would be that they would give us formal notice of their intention to abrogate those treaties and engagements after a certain date. We might remonstrate; we might negotiate; but we do not know that we could refuse to accept such notice. The practical shape, therefore, in which the question will come us is this: 'Shall we recognize their independent sovereignty, without requiring as a condition that they shall renew and observe the anti-slave trade treaties which subsist with their northern brethren—or even accept more strin-

gent ones?' Doubtless we shall endeavor, and in consistency, and as a matter of duty ought to endeavor, to make this condition; since we cannot shut our eyes to their notorious and avowed design of reviving the abominable traffic, and to pretend to do so would be to surrender the most passionately and pertinaciously pursued object of our national policy. We shall urge upon them that the trade is prohibited by international agreement and by municipal law in every civilized nation in the world, and that we recognize and treat with no nation as civilized which persists in upholding it. They will, of course, refuse to accept such a condition, as it would defeat one of their principal purposes; and will insist on unconditional recognition. What are we to do then? It might seem that we are simply helpless in the matter. Three courses are open to us—none of them entirely satisfactory.

"We may recognize their independence at once, in accordance with our usual practice, and when we have done so, may proceed to make the best terms that we can as to the anti-slave trade treaties. But this course, though the simplest and easiest, would be very painful to our feelings of humanity—for we cannot disguise from ourselves that it would be nearly equivalent to unconditional surrender."

The only difficulties apprehended in this article we, here on this side of the Atlantic, know to be only imaginary. It is well settled that no purpose exists in the seceded States to reopen the African slave trade. The question of the recognition of the Southern Confederacy was never a matter of doubt and is no longer debatable.

How the dissolution of the Union is regarded in a political point of view, the following pregnant remarks fully indicate:

"Apart from this perplexing question, we see no reason for anticipating that a severance of the Union, *once effected* peaceably, and without catastrophe, will be in any way injurious to Great Britain. On the contrary, we are not sure that it may not indirectly be rather beneficial than otherwise. In the first place, we may expect that America will be somewhat less aggressive, less insolent, and less irritable than she has been. Instead of *one* vast State, acting on every foreign question *cum toto corpore regni*, we shall have *two*, with different objects and interests, and by no means always disposed to act in concert or in cordiality. Instead of *one*, showing an encroaching and somewhat bullying front to the rest of the world, we shall have *two*, showing something of the same front to each other. Each will be more occupied with its immediate neighbor, and therefore less inclined to pick quarrels with more distant nations. Then, too, for some time at least, the inordinate, though most natural sense of unrivaled prosperity and power, which swelled so flatulently and disturbingly in the breast of every citizen of the great transatlantic Republic, will receive a salutary check. Their demeanor is likely to become somewhat humbler and more rational, and it will, therefore, be easier to maintain amicable and *tranquil* relations with them than it has been. In place, too, of Europe being obliged to watch and thwart their annexing tendencies, the two federations will probably exercise this sort of moral police over each other."

Though remarks like these tend to wound our national pride, we have the consolation of knowing that such a result has been produced by the aggressive course of the North, and that the South has carried her submission to wrong as far as she could go, without degradation and ruin to her own people.

[As the session progressed the chances of an amicable settlement seemed to diminish. It was evident that while the Republicans were averse to having a war with a majority of the Southern States, yet they were not unwilling to see a resistance upon a small scale, which might be suppressed, and thus strengthen their authority, and aid their purposes to enlarge the powers of the government for further uses. If assured that they would have to fight only the cotton States, the collision would have been welcomed, and, in fact, courted. Their purpose evidently was to soothe and quiet the South as much as possible, and prevent resistance, or even preparation for it, outside of the cotton States, and thus cause the other States to be blinded to the impending danger. The peace conference served their purposes very well by assisting to amuse the Southern people, and cheat them by holding out delusive hopes. The Union men of the South aided them greatly by sending home letters and telegrams, from time to time, assuring their constituents that everything was being settled. The state of opinion in the middle Southern States was carefully studied by Republicans, that they might see whether there was danger of their coming into the contest.]

With a view of apprising the people of North Carolina of the truth, and that I might be able to induce them to make such a demonstration as would tend to arrest the Northern war movement, I sent many letters and telegrams to editors and politicians in the State, some of which are presented as specimens.]

Letter to W. H. Thomas, Esq.

SENATE CHAMBER, Washington, Jan. 9, 1861.

Dear Sir:—Your dispatch reached me last night, giving the information of the passage of the bill to arm the State. Had this bill and one to call a convention been passed a month ago, I think it probable that a sufficient impression might have been made on the Black Republicans to induce them to consent to some adjustment of the difficulties between the two sections. But the delay in our State, and similar evidences of hesitation or division in the South, encouraged our enemies. They came to the conclusion that they would have to meet no resistance outside of the cotton States, and they believed that they would be able to crush that resistance by military force. Under this impression, they as a party took a stand against any substantial concession. Having taken that position, there seems to be no indication whatever that any adjustment is to be made that will protect our honor or maintain our rights.

While I am, as one of the representatives of the South, at all times ready to accept any proper settlement, I cannot hold out at present any inducement to delay action. The obvious policy and purpose of the Black Republicans is to keep the South unprepared and divided until they can get into power, and then their intention is unmistakable—to use all the power of the government to compel the South to submit to their domination, to the extent even of abolishing slavery, should civil war afford them a tolerable pretext. If, however, North Carolina, Virginia and the border States will act at once, they may, by preserving a united South, avert the evils of civil war.

Such I think will be the result, unless there shall, before the inauguration be a military conflict. The Black Republicans are endeavoring

by all the means in their power to induce Mr. Buchanan to begin the war. Gen. Scott, who is here directing the military movements, is on their line of policy. I have for the last two weeks been satisfied that unless the President reviewed all his orders, we should certainly be involved in war at a very early day.

The message of the President, received to-day and now under discussion, can be construed in no other light than as a *war message*. Though he disclaims the right to coerce or make war in terms, yet he declares a purpose to enforce all the laws of the United States by military power in the seceding States. More than this he could not do, for no one would ask him to enforce laws that did not exist. Lincoln himself would not, probably, at this time, resort to mere despotic acts outside of the existing laws.

Whether, therefore, our purpose be to obtain Constitutional guarantees, to avert civil war, or to maintain our honor, and the property of our citizens, it is equally the duty of the State to arm itself, and in convention of our people take action such as the emergency may demand. The sooner that Convention is called, and the fewer restrictions attempted to be imposed on it, the better for the whole country. Though I have frequently expressed these views to you and to other members of our General Assembly, yet such is the importance of the subject, that I hope you will excuse my repeating them again. You are at liberty to make any use you may think proper of these views.

W. H. THOMAS, Esq.

Very truly, yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

Letter to Hon. Jas. W. Osborne.

SENATE CHAMBER, Washington, February 18, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR:—The pressure of public business has prevented my writing to you at an earlier day. There is not at this time the slightest prospect that any just Constitutional guarantees will be obtained, as our Legislature has unanimously demanded as a condition of submission to Lincoln. In fact, since the news of the Tennessee election reached this place, there seems to be no prospect of any compromise being adopted by the Black Republicans.

Lincoln and the bulk of his party declare that they will make no concessions to traitors and rebels, as they characterize the seceding States, and that until they have been reduced to obedience, or, in fact, subjugated, no terms of conciliation are to be listened to.

Our State, as well as the entire South, has declared against this policy of coercion. The great practical question, therefore, for North Carolina to decide is, whether she will aid Lincoln in this policy of coercion, or join the Southern States in resisting it. If she remains in the Union under Lincoln, she must not only furnish him money to wage war against the seceding States, but is liable to be called on to furnish men also. If she joins him in the war against the Southern seceding States, she must, in the end, expect to have slavery abolished by force of arms, and to see the

South reduced to the condition of Jamaica or St. Domingo ; or, in other words, to a condition of *free negro equality*.

The abolitionists are the aggressors in this war, while the Southern States are merely claiming their Constitutional rights, as North Carolina has again and again declared. I repeat, that the great practical question for us to determine is, whether we shall, as a people, aid Lincoln in this war on the South, or aid the South in defending its rights in common with our own.

All except those who are at heart for *unconditional submission* to the Black Republicans, will soon see that this is now the practical issue to be decided. A vote for submission is in effect a vote for *civil war* and *free negro equality* over the South.

But, should North Carolina take a stand for resistance, her influence, and that of Virginia, may be sufficient to arrest the purpose of Lincoln and his followers, for they are disinclined to fight a united South, and peace may, in that way, be secured.

The above, hurriedly written as it is, will give you a just idea, I think, of the prospect before us, and you are at liberty to use it as your best judgment may dictate.

I am very truly yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

Hon. JAS. W. OSBORNE, Charlotte, N. C.

Telegram to the Editor of the Charlotte Bulletin.

WASHINGTON, February 18, 1861.

There is no chance whatever for Crittenden's proposition. North Carolina must secede or aid Lincoln in making war on the South.

T. L. CLINGMAN.

[As the session proceeded it became more and more evident that the Republicans were anxious to avoid, as much as possible, alarming the people of the South, and thereby preventing preparations for resistance. While many of them were waiting to see whether the movement would extend beyond the cotton States, they were all resolved apparently to keep the people of the South in the dark as to any hostile purposes they might entertain. Mr. Douglas co-operated strongly with them in insisting that there was no reason to apprehend war. He and other Union men really, without intending to do so probably, materially aided in bringing about the collision. As evidence of the nature of the efforts then made, and of the general current of feeling prevailing at the time, the following extracts from the debates as reported in the *Globe* are presented:]

REMARKS

ON PRESIDENT LINCOLN'S INAUGURAL, DELIVERED IN THE
UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 6, 1861.

Mr. CLINGMAN said :

Mr. PRESIDENT : I agree with the honorable Senator from Illinois that there are some points upon which this inaugural is obscure ; but they are upon the limitations and conditions. Upon the main points there is no obscurity at all. Allow me to call the attention of that Senator to a few direct sentences :

“ I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken ; and to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States.”

Can anything be more explicit than that ? How does the President execute the laws of the Union in Virginia and Pennsylvania ? By occupying the forts that are there, the arsenals and public property, and collecting the duties. That is precisely what he says he intends to do in all the States. But the honorable Senator says that he may not have the power to do that ; and if the people do not give him the power he cannot do it, and therefore he draws his hope. Let us see how that stands ? The President of the United States now has the control of an army, perhaps of fifteen thousand men. They are scattered far and wide about the country ; but in a few weeks half of them, perhaps more, can be concentrated. Will he feel bound to use that army, and the ships of war at his hand to take possession of Fort Moultrie ? Clearly the language implies it. Fort Moultrie has been taken possession of by those men whom he pronounces insurgents and revolutionists.

This is his language.

“ It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union ; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void ; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to the circumstances.”

Mr. Lincoln, upon his own showing, is pledged to regard the taking possession of those forts by the State authority as “ insurrectionary or revolutionary.” To make the matter more specific, however, if there

could be any doubt about words of such plain import, we have the following :

“ The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy and possess the property and places belonging to the Government, and to collect the duties on imports.”

Is it true that he says, as the Senator supposes, that there will be no bloodshed or violence? He says :

“ But beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere.”

What does that mean? It means that Mr. Lincoln will not use force upon obedient men. He does not do it in the District of Columbia. I presume he does not propose to do it anywhere throughout the Union. Those men who obey the laws he will not make war against; but he intends to compel everybody to obedience. The honorable Senator from Illinois knows very well that the States which have seceded claim that they are free from all obligation to pay taxes to this Government, and that they have a right to occupy those forts. Mr. Lincoln says he will compel them to pay taxes to this Government, and that he has a right to occupy those forts, and will do it to the extent of his ability; and if they submit, there will be no bloodshed. Suppose that I say that I intend to occupy the house of the honorable Senator from Illinois, contrary to all right, as he thinks, and I declare to him, “ there will be no force or violence if you submit and give up possession to me;” everybody knows that my declaration, that I did not desire violence, would not amount to anything if I declared a purpose to do an unlawful act, or an act that he regarded as unlawful. The States that have seceded regard their right to the forts within their limits as just as good as any man regards the right to his own house. They do not mean to be turned out of them except by force; and hence, when the President says he intends to execute the laws and take possession of the public property, of course, if that be attempted, a collision is inevitable.

* * * * *

But, Mr. President, I say the practical question is now upon us: shall we have these forts taken; shall we have a collision; shall there be an attempt to collect the revenue in the seceding States or not? It will not do to ask the country to wait two or three or more years, as the Senator from New York suggested, to obtain constitutional amendments. If Mr. Lincoln intends to use the power in his hands, as he states in his inaugural, we must have war. If he does not, I think he is unfortunate in his declarations. If I were a friend of the President, I should advise him to withdraw the troops from Fort Sumter and Fort Pickens. They are of no earthly use there. The only effect of their presence is to irritate those States. Will those States stand still while Mr. Lincoln calls Congress together to get the force bill enacted which is suggested? I doubt if they will do so. It seems to me the true policy for his friends and him to take is, to withdraw those troops, and leave the other questions, if there be other questions, for negotiation. I would suspend all attempts to execute, not merely the Post Office laws, but the revenue laws especially. It is no concession to the Government to decline to carry the mails, because it is not so much for the advantage of the Government as the people. I shall not, however, Mr. President, further take up the time of the Senate.

REMARKS

ON THE WAR POLICY OF THE ADMINISTRATION, DELIVERED
IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 19, 1861.

Mr. CLINGMAN said :

Mr. PRESIDENT. When I took the floor yesterday, I was about to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. Hale,] whose course of remark I thought rendered it legitimate for me to do so, to one point in connection with a subject that he alluded to; and I avail myself of this occasion to call his attention, and that of other Senators, to the subject.

It will be recollected, Mr. President, that when the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. Dixon) offered a resolution to print the inaugural, I expressed the opinion that it meant war; that the policy of the President as there indicated, must necessarily lead to war; and I so characterized it. The honorable Senator from Illinois, not at this moment in his seat, (Mr. Douglas,) expressed a different opinion; and bringing to the view of the Senate several statements made in it, argued that its policy was that of peace. Since then the honorable Senator from Illinois has argued at considerable length, and with great force, and I admit that some of the facts to which he alluded did tend very much to bring my mind to the conclusion that the President, after all, might not attempt to carry out what he declared to be his duty.

I had some hope, from the array of facts presented by the honorable Senator from Illinois, that the policy of the Administration might not be one calculated or intended to involve us inevitably in civil war; but there is one pregnant difficulty in the way; and if the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, or any other Senator, can relieve my mind on that point, I should be very much gratified. If the policy be (as has been contended by the Senator from Illinois and others) one of peace, why should it not be announced? Everybody knows that the country is suffering, that commerce is paralyzed, that manufacturers are depressed, that stocks are down, that there is a general stagnation and distress throughout the land; and, as has been well said by the Senator from Illinois, if the Administration would announce a peaceful policy, we should at once be relieved from these difficulties. Why should it not be done, if that, in fact, be the policy? Everybody will see that it is eminently important that it should be so; but if, on the other hand, a different policy be intended, I can well understand why it should, for the time, be concealed; and I apprehend, and I am forced very reluctantly to the conclusion, that it is the settled policy of those in power to involve us very soon in civil war. Their silence is pregnant, to my mind. Suppose that were the policy; what would the Government do? Would it indicate it at once? By no means. The Government troops are scattered far and wide over the country. Two or three thousand of them, perhaps, are in Texas; and if war were declared at once, there can be no doubt that the people of Texas could make prisoners of that portion of the army. The troops that the Government has, are not

only scattered far and wide, but its ships are on every sea. I understand, and I presume there is no doubt about the fact, that orders have gone to the Mediterranean and to the distant stations, to bring our ships home. Why? If there is a peaceful policy intended, why should our ships be brought out of the Mediterranean? Are they not as necessary now at that point as they ever were? Why is such an immense armament being collected at New York? For if we are to believe the newspapers and private correspondence, there is a larger number of ships of war there now than has ever been collected on our coast at any one time in the last twenty years.

Mr. Grimes. I think they have not been ordered home from the Mediterranean.

Mr. Clingman. It is so stated. I do not know what the fact may be.

Mr. Clark. It was so stated during Buchanan's administration.

Mr. Clingman. I will ask the honorable Senator from Iowa—and shall be obliged to him for the information—does he believe that distant ships at the Mediterranean and elsewhere have not been ordered home?

Mr. Grimes. I made enquiries a day or two since on that subject, and learned that they had not been ordered home from the Mediterranean. I made the inquiry of those who I supposed were informed.

Mr. Clingman. Then, I take that to be true. Have they been ordered home from distant stations anywhere? Perhaps the Senator can inform me.

Mr. Grimes. I have no knowledge on that subject.

Mr. Clingman. The Senator has no knowledge on that subject, but only in reference to the Mediterranean. I am very much pleased to hear what he has stated as to that, but it is rumored that ships stationed at distant places have been ordered home; and it is strange that the Senator should inquire as to the Mediterranean and not inquire as to the others.

Mr. Grimes. Not at all. I was interested as to parties on board some of the vessels there.

Mr. Clingman. Then I will take that explanation, that the inquiry as to the Mediterranean, was accidental, or, at least, not connected with this particular subject. My very purpose was to get information of that kind.

Now, sir, I come to the point which I wish to put to honorable Senators. There can be no doubt that troops are being drawn in from distant places and collected together, and that a number of ships are taking in supplies. If the policy of the Administration were war, of course it would conceal it until it was ready to strike; it would require several weeks until a movement was made. I will state in this connection, that I have information within the last two or three days which leads me to believe that troops and heavy guns are to be sent South to take possession of the forts in North Carolina, Virginia, and elsewhere. This has been brought to my ears within a few days from sources that I rely on. How the fact will turn out, I am not prepared to say; but I do say, that if that result follows, I shall regard it as evidence of a purpose to make war. I need only call Senators' minds to what occurred two months ago. About two months ago there was a report that troops were sent South, and that war measures were to be inaugurated; and

thereupon some of my own constituents went into the forts of the Government and took possession of them. They were very soon informed however, that this was erroneous information, and they were evacuated; they were evacuated by order of the Governor, and the people have remained quiet ever since. If we are to have a state of peace, the Government, and you and I, all know, that those forts are in no danger of occupation; but if war measures are to be inaugurated, then it is very natural that the Government should send troops down to take possession of them; and I say, frankly, that I think the country is entitled to know from the Administration, and to know from Senators who are in a position to understand, what we are to expect; for if there be a policy to occupy the forts in the Confederate States, and to collect the revenue, we all know that is war. It is idle for gentlemen to talk about words, to speak of what is war, and what is peace; you and I and all of us know, as was well and ably argued by the Senator from Illinois, that if that be attempted, we have war. I wish to know it.

Mr. Clark. The honorable Senator will permit me. Allusion has been made several times to the Senators on this side, to their being mute; and it has been said that they could state the policy of the Administration if they would. Now, let me say to the honorable Senator, that I know of no person on this side who has any information on the subject. I have no reason to believe that any person knows any more than has been stated in the inaugural; and the honorable Senator and other Senators on that side can put their interpretation on that just as we can. We have no authority, and I think no knowledge, from which we can state to Senators on the other side.

Mr. Clingman. It is a little extraordinary that Senators, occupying the relation they do towards the Administration should not know what are its purposes. They know that, while I interpreted the inaugural one way, the Senator from Illinois interpreted it very differently. They know that the country is divided on the subject. It was said by the Senator from Massachusetts that they had only been eight or ten days in power, and had not had time, perhaps, to determine their policy. Now I say the country has a right to know what it is to expect. The present state of things cannot continue long without collision. If this Government threatens, the Confederate States will not wait until it has organized powerful armaments, and pounced down upon them. If the Government's policy be to provoke collision, and say it is not responsible, it seems to me it is taking proper course to do it. If I should continue to threaten a man, and decline to give him any explanations, it would not be surprising if he should anticipate me, and begin the contest.

Mr. Clark. Will the Senator pardon me for again interrupting him? I do not do it in any factious spirit.

Mr. Clingman. I do not suppose any such thing. I am happy to hear the Senator.

Mr. Clark. He speaks of the threats of this Administration. If he will look at the inaugural, he will see that the President says there can be no assault on his part; the President will assail nobody. Instead of being a threat, I think it should be received as he intended—the Government will assail nobody.

Mr. Clingman. But the President said this Government would possess and occupy its forts in the Confederate States. The Senator nods his assent. The Government says: "we intend to take possession of Fort Moultrie and Fort Pulaski, and the other forts of which the State authorities have got possession; they are our property; we are going to take possession of them; there will be no war, no bloodshed, if you submit." That is the amount of it. Am I to enter into an argument with the honorable Senator to prove what I know—and he must know, too, take it, so that I cannot enlighten him on that point—that that necessarily provokes collision? Mr. Lincoln says: "I intend to make you pay taxes to the Government, which you say you do not owe; you say you are independent; I deny it; you are as much a part of the Union as you ever were; you are bound to pay the taxes; you must let us occupy the forts we have in your territory; it depends on you whether there shall be bloodshed; if you submit, there will be none at all." In other words, "if you obey, I will not strike you; if you disobey my commands, if you decline to give up those forts, if you refuse to pay the revenue which I intend to collect of you, your blood will be on your own heads." That is the result to which we are brought. True, Mr. Lincoln says it is not a threat. Oh, no! no threat! I go to a man and say, "I intend to do as I please with your property, or what you consider your property; and if you resort to force, you must thank yourself only for your suffering, if it falls on you."

I am very glad to get even this explanation from the Senator from New Hampshire. It shows an evidence on his part of a willingness courteously to give me all the information he can. And what is it? "That if you submit to the policy of the Government—if you surrender back the forts or allow the Government to take them, and pay duties to it, there is peace; otherwise, you have war." And, as was well argued by the honorable Senator from Illinois, that is necessarily war. There is no Senator here who would pretend that you could collect revenue or occupy the forts without a collision of arms; and honorable Senators do not mislead anybody by us different terms. If any other Senator could go further than the Senator from New Hampshire, I should be gratified.

I have made these remarks, Mr. President, with no view of producing irritation; but seeing the condition of the country, and the apprehension that now prevails, I was very much in hopes that something might come out from the other side indicative of a peaceful disposition on the part of the Administration. I wish no war. No one can wish it, I take it. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. Hale,) who has heard what his colleague has said, if he can say anything further to relieve us, will. He concluded his speech with some sentiments that were very patriotic. He declared, if I understood him aright, that if States were discontented, if they were thoroughly dissatisfied with the Union, rather than use force to compel them to remain in, he would let two other discontented States go with them, or words to that effect. That is a policy which I understand. It is frank and manly, and I think patriotic; and if the Administrator adopts that policy, there will be no collision.

But, Mr. President, there is another difficulty in the way, and we might as well talk frankly. I know it is present to the minds of Senators on the other side, and they must see the difficulty. The honorable

Senator from Rhode Island, (Mr. Simmons,) particularly, who engineered the tariff bill through, of course sees the difficulty. Well, why should we not talk together frankly as Senators about it? The revenues under that tariff bill cannot be collected anywhere, I think, if the declarations which gentlemen make are to be acted out. If they are to hold that all the Confederate States are in the Union, and that you are to have no custom houses on the line between them and the other States, what will be the result? Goods will come into New Orleans, Charleston, Mobile, and other places; they will come in paying a low tariff, and merchants from Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio, if they choose to go down there and buy goods, will take them home and pay no duties. No man from the Northwest will go to New York, and pay a duty of fifty per cent. on goods that he can get at fifteen or twenty per cent. duty at New Orleans. That will be the course of trade, of course. Senators must see that you cannot have two tariffs, one high and one low, in operation in the country at once, with any effect produced by the high tariff. If you go to a man and say: "You may pay me a high price or a low price for an article," you will never get the high price. When, therefore, you attempt to carry out the new tariff, which contains rates, I think, of fifty per cent., and some of one hundred per cent., and some even above one hundred per cent., you cannot collect those rates at Boston and New York and Philadelphia, while the men who want to consume the goods can get them by paying a duty of only one-third as much. That is impossible. I take it, therefore, that all gentlemen must see that, in the present condition of things, matters cannot stand. If the independence of those States be recognized, and you establish a line of custom houses along them, you may make us in North Carolina, for example, pay as high duties as you please. I do not like to pay them, and I do not think my people will; but I tell Senators that, if matters stand as they now are, the merchants from my region will go down to Charleston, as they often do, and buy goods under a low tariff. They would rather do that than go north and buy them under a high tariff. That will be the effect. You will get no revenue, therefore, under your high tariff, in a little time, if this discrepancy is to continue.

Then, I presume, it is not intended to be so. I presume the Senator from Rhode Island, and those who acted with him, did not intend the tariff, which has been lately passed, to be a mere farce, a mere thing on paper, not to be acted out. Of course, the mean to get duties under it in some way or other. If you do not mean to have your line of custom houses along the border of the Confederate States, you must expect to stop importations there. How will you do it? I know you cannot do it legally without new legislation; you cannot do it without calling Congress together, and having laws passed to enable you to do it. How far the limits of the Constitution will restrain it, is a question which may be argued hereafter; but it impossible that things shall stand in this way, and therefore I regard that as furnishing a pregnant circumstance also, to show that the policy of the Administration is necessarily a hostile one. I should be glad to believe otherwise. I should be very much gratified indeed, as a Senator and an individual, if the Senator from New Hamp-

shire, or the Senator from Rhode Island, or anybody else, could give me such assurances as I should like to have.

My purpose, Mr. President, was not to discuss the general question, but to state why it is that I cannot adopt the view of the Senator from Illinois; why I think all the tracks now point in one direction, and that is towards collision and war.

Mr. Hale. The Senator from North Carolina spoke to me once last evening, and once this morning. I will answer him as far as I can, and I will do it frankly; and let me say, when I do so, I answer as I do because it is the truth, and not because I have any fault to find with anybody. I know no more what the Administration intend than that Senator does. I have no more means of knowing what they intend, than that Senator has. I presume he has been consulted just as frequently and as intimately as I have been; and I know he has given as much advice to the President, and to each and every head of a Department, as I have, and has heard as much from them.

Mr. Clingman. I can only say to the honorable Senator that I have not communicated with one of them, either verbally or in writing; so that, if his relations are like my own, he is certainly very distant from them.

Mr. Hale. Well, sir, that is just the case with me. (Laughter.) I have neither corresponded nor consulted with the President or any head of a Department, verbally or in writing, in reference to any single subject of public policy, nor in regard to a single appointment that they have made—not one.

Mr. Clingman. Will the honorable Senator allow me to add one other word?

Mr. Hale. Yes.

Mr. Clingman. I think—and I say this in good faith and in all sincerity—it indicates a very great want of intelligence on the part of the Administration that the Senator has not been consulted, both on account of his position in the party, which would give him great weight, and also on account of that ability and acquaintance with the affairs of the Government which he possesses. I say this rather with regret, as evincing a want of that statesmanship on the part of the Administration that I think it ought to possess.

INCREDULITY ABOUT WAR.

It may seem strange now that such a delusion should have existed, but so little apprehension then prevailed in the public mind that war was imminent, that occasionally such remarks as these were made to me, derisively: "Well, Clingman, when is your war to begin? Where are your fighting men? I do not see any of them in the streets." Now and then a Northern man would say, "I wish some of your people would commit an overt act, so that we might hang two or three, and make them quit their boasting and behave better." A Senator from the extreme Southwest said to me one day, "Clingman, there will be no war; but if it does begin, we will end it by marching

up to Massachusetts, and blowing up Plymouth rock and throwing it into the sea."

When Mr. Lincoln did come in, his policy was evidently unsettled. Though not perhaps averse to a small war, to be finished by blockading a few ports, yet he did not wish to undertake "a big job," as he afterwards called it, against the majority of the Southern States. Such was his hesitation that at the close of the extra session, towards the end of March, I began to think he would let matters rest as they were, and call a session of Congress to consider the condition of the country. On my return to Washington, after two or three days absence in New York, I met Mr. Crawford, one of the Southern Commissioners, and asked him the news. "Very bad," he answered, "it now looks as if we were to have war." In answer to my enquiring as to what had produced the change of policy, he said that it was in part due to the action of the Virginia Convention in voting, by a large majority, against secession. This action, after the failure of the peace conference, he said had encouraged the administration to believe that they would have only the cotton States to fight, and they felt confident that the government would be able without difficulty to put them down. It has since been made public that up to about this period the administration was rather disinclined to resort to war. A member of Mr. Lincoln's cabinet told me in the summer of 1866, that at this time Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Seward, and every member of the cabinet, except my informant, were in favor of letting Anderson retire from Fort Sumter, as soon as his provisions were exhausted. This gentleman told me that he individually remonstrated against such a course, saying that if it were taken, in six weeks every foreign government would recognize the Confederacy. This argument failing, he threatened to resign as a member of the cabinet, and at length thus induced them to resolve to assist Anderson, and therefore they sent a notice to Governor Pickens that the armistice was ended. Mr. Secretary Wells confirms this statement, for he said in his controversy with Mr. Adams, that the President, and every member of the cabinet except one, were in favor of this policy. He even charges that Mr. Seward purposely, with artful strategy, caused the ships of the government to be sent out of the way, so as to render it impossible to attempt to reinforce Anderson. There can be no doubt, I think, that Mr. Seward was sincere, at least, in his assurances to many persons that Sumter and Pickens would be abandoned by the government. In fact, Mr. Seward's demeanor in the Senate after the States had begun to secede, satisfied me that he had been greatly surprised by the action of the States. Such was his mental constitution that he could not understand that any one would attempt an enterprise of hazard and difficulty, unless there seemed to be a prospect of material advantage. He was, therefore, evidently amazed with the developments, and when we occasionally met and conversed, his manner reminded me of a man who had suddenly and most unexpectedly seen a ghost. He evidently at this time desired peace, and doubtless acted as represented by his colleagues in the cabinet.

These facts tend to show how near we were of escaping war at that time. Had either North Carolina, or Tennessee, or Virginia, shown a purpose to act with the Confederacy before the fight at Sumter, instead of war there would have been an appeal to Congress, to ascertain if an accommodation could not be made; and, in the event of failure, it is not unlikely that the "erring sisters" would have been allowed to "go in peace," and Lincoln would have "run the machine as he found it," to use his homely but striking phrase. Persons may find interesting reading on this subject in some of the editorials of New York *Tribune* after Virginia did take action.

SINGULAR FALLACY.

Attempts have sometimes been made to create the impression that the late civil war was mainly, if not entirely, owing to a difference of opinion between the Northern and Southern people, as to whether we should have a consolidated or a federal system of government. Nothing is further from the truth, and no view is more superficial than this. In fact, the people of New England are as strongly in favor of local government *per se* as any people on earth. I know of none more averse to all foreign control, or more anxious to have their own way, in all that concerns them as a people. It may be remembered that when they were resisting the fugitive slave law, they fell back on State's rights principles, and such men as Charles Sumner, Ben Wade and others of that class, began to eulogise the Virginia resolution of 1798, just as when the Federalists of New England opposed "Jim Madison's war" against Great Britain, they, in the Hartford Convention, advocated the right of secession.

Why, then, in the late contest, did they insist on enlarging the powers of the general government? The answer is clear and conclusive to any one who will look at the facts. It will appear from the debates in the Convention which formed the Federal Constitution, that the principle inducement to the New England States to form the Union was to obtain such benefits as they expected to derive from navigation and tariff laws. It may be remembered that Mr. Rufus King said, he "had always expected that as the Southern States are the richest, they would not league themselves with the Northern, unless some respect was paid to their superior wealth. If the latter expect those preferential distinctions in commerce, and other advantages, which they will derive from the connection, they must not expect to receive them without allowing some advantages in return." Though, in fact, the North-eastern States did make a great deal of money out of the Southern, and after a while, the Western States, by reason of tariffs and navigation laws, yet still their demands became more and more exorbitant, and they were provoked by the opposition they met, chiefly in the South.

The Abolitionists also saw that they could not reach slavery in the Southern States, except through the action of the Federal government, and hence they combined with those who merely wished to convert the government into a money making machine for their own use. These parties thus combined, therefore, to effect their several purposes, in the only mode in which it was practicable for them to succeed.

Let us illustrate the operation by supposing a case like this: There were in a small town a number of thieves, who wished to rob the citizens, but who found themselves powerless to carry out their designs. They know, however, that there are five hundred muskets in the arsenal of the town. Their leaders assert, that by the law of the country, the citizens are entitled to bear arms, and insist that these arms ought to be distributed to the people. The town authorities object, regarding the operation as wholly unnecessary. The contest is kept up for a long time, and with much acrimony and heat. At length the authorities give way, and agree that the arms may be handed out to such citizens as desire them, on their promise to keep them in good condition. The greater part of the citizens are careless, so that the thieves, acting in concert, secure the weapons. Soon after this, they, during the night, fire the town, rob it, and in the contest kill a number of the citizens. What would be thought of a historian, who narrating these events, should say that the town had been destroyed, because a contest arose among the people as to

the point, whether or not the citizens had a right to bear arms? Such an historian would be as wise, and as profound, as are those who represent the late contest as having grown out of a difference of opinion between the North and the South as to the extent of the powers that ought to be recognized as belonging to the Federal government.

POPULAR DELUSIONS.

The consideration of the facts referred to in the course of this publication, will tend to impress the mind with some interesting phenomena of a political and moral character. On a first view of the subject it would seem that in a country like the United States, abounding as it does in newspapers, railroads and telegraphs, and with a people remarkable for their love of newspaper reading and travelling, it would seem, I say, impossible that a general open condition of opinion should prevail in one or more of the States, without that state of opinion becoming generally known in other sections of the Union, in the course of a few years. Such, however, was not the fact, and the people of large sections of the country remained for a long period profoundly ignorant of the state of feeling, and even of the actual physical condition of other large districts.

Four remarkably strange delusions may be noticed. Two of them prevailed in the South and two in the North. First, almost the entire body of Whigs in the South for years remained in profound ignorance of the opinions and political action of the majority of their party in the Northern States, on a question so important that it, in their opinion, involved the continuance, or destruction of the common government. This state of things continued in the face of the most decided public action, by votes, and speeches, and newspaper articles.

A second delusion affected a large portion of the Southern Democrats. They were deluded with the idea that the people of the North, though they loved the Union for its profits, would not go to war for it, or even if they did, the fight would be made so feebly, and on so diminutive a scale, that one of the cotton States would have been able to resist it.

The two delusions in the North were perhaps even more remarkable. Though the publications of the productions of the Southern States as made in the census and other official reports, as well as all reliable evidence, rendered it clear that the amount of provisions produced in the slaveholding States, and their capacity to support themselves if left alone, excelled those of the Northern States, yet the general opinion of the North ignored all this. It was asserted with such repetition and confidence in the abolition newspapers, and those sympathizing with them, and reiterated by popular speakers so incessantly, that the majority of the people were made to believe that the South would perish, if the North did not support it. It was affirmed that the South had not intelligence and energy enough to make its own axe helves. These things were so incessantly proclaimed, that in time men like General Scott came to believe them; and Mr. Seward really appeared to think that none of the Southern States would be guilty of the folly of seceding, and even when they did attempt it, they would, like the prodigal son, soon return to escape starvation.

I remember that one day in the House, I had a conversation with a member from the interior of the State of New York, who asserted that from the

foundation of the government, there had been no increase in the white population of the South. So vehement was he in his assertion, that I sent to the library for the census report, and to his great astonishment he saw, that if the foreign immigration were deducted, the increase of population in the Southern States had been greater than it was in the North, even among the white population alone.

When Mr. Giddings would declare as he usually did once or twice in the House during each session, that the United States, mighty as it was, was not powerful enough to kick the little State of South Carolina out of the Union, but that she would hold on to it as a drowning man to his only plank, the broad grin over the countenances of the Northern members, showed clearly that not only did all the Whigs entertain this opinion, but that also many Democrats sympathized with the speaker. Probably, if not on that very day, at any rate before the end of a week, some well meaning Southern Whig would declare that they could not be induced to secede, but that they would die by the glorious Union.

Such declarations not only encouraged Giddings and his friends, but materially aided to produce the second delusion to be mentioned.

It was a prevalent opinion in the North that even if the South were to attempt resistance, it would make such a feeble fight as to be very easily put down. When Watson Webb said, in the columns of the New York *Courier and Enquirer*, that the seventh regiment of the city volunteers could conquer the Southern States, that declaration was accepted as not unreasonable. On one occasion, I stated in a speech in the House, that the Southern States could maintain in the field at least one hundred and fifty thousand men, and thereupon the *National Intelligencer* declared that I had beaten Bissell, of Illinois, in bragging, and that thereafter I was to be regarded as the greatest boaster of the day.

Unless my memory is greatly in error, a number of the New York *Tribune*, which came through the lines in the spring of 1861, contained an editorial defending Mr. Lincoln from the charge of extravagance in calling for so many as seventy-five thousand men to serve for three months. The editor stated that twenty-five thousand men were needed to conquer the South, that owing to the extent of its territory, twenty-five thousand more would be needed to hold the country after it was conquered, and that the remaining twenty-five thousand would form a proper reserve to be held for any unforeseen emergency.

Inasmuch as the Southern people were accused of being personally too pugnacious, and as they had in the war of 1812, and that against Mexico, placed in the field a much larger number of men than the North, when the relative populations of the two sections were considered, why did such a delusion prevail? The errors both in the North and the South were due to the fact that the speakers and papers in each section, for party purposes, sought to make the impressions that were, in a political point, advantageous to them. And hence, the most striking facts were ignored, kept out of view, or denied.

We have at present similar illustrations of the power of party leaders and presses to deceive the masses. Though perhaps more than fifty thousand men from the Northern States have been in North Carolina without molestation in person or property, yet I am often asked in the North, by persons who daily read the newspapers, the question, "When will it be safe for a Northern man to go into your State?" In other words, newspapers are just as potent to teach error as truth, and hence people in the North really know less of this State, than they do of foreign countries.

Delusions like these on both sides led to the war. I recollect that as early

as the year 1850, Senator Westcott, of Florida, said to me, "There will be no war, for both sides are afraid; the North would run if it believed the South would fight, and the South would run if it believed the North would fight." I told him, that in the very fact he stated consisted the danger; that I once saw a fight between two men, each of whom knew the other to be an arrant coward, and that while each of them expected the other to run, as they were advancing, they got together and had to fight it out, and that I expected the collision to occur in this way, if it did at all.

With our present information, on a survey of the past, is it not clear that with a better understanding of the facts we should have escaped the collision. Suppose it could have been, by one in whom there was full confidence, stated to the people of the North, "When you have continued the war for years, and have placed in the field more than two millions of soldiers, and incurred a debt of more than two thousand million dollars, you will not have been able to capture either Richmond or Charleston," is it not almost certain that a different action would have been taken by the people of the North? And if, on the other hand, the people of the South had foreseen the magnitude of the armies to be brought against them, would they have been divided into three factions, as they in fact were, or have allowed themselves to be managed as they did in the movements which preceded the war?

CONCLUSION OF THE SLAVERY DISCUSSION.

Persons who may read this publication, will, I think, see that, profiting by the information I obtained during my first term in Congress, my efforts were mainly directed to two great objects.

In the first place, to the reduction of the tariff taxes, and the diminution of expenditures, so as to lighten as much as possible the public burden. This policy was attended with complete success, and the tariff was reduced to a rate of only twenty-four per cent. on the higher articles. The free list had, by the efforts mainly of the manufacturers, been made too large, but the imposition of not more than twenty per cent. duties, on certain articles included in it, would, with the taxes already collected on the protected articles, have furnished all the revenue needed for the legitimate expenses of the government. In fact, the condition of the United States was, in the year 1860, one of the highest general prosperity.

In the second place, regarding the slavery issue as of paramount importance in its consequences, my efforts were earnestly and perseveringly directed to effect one of four things.

The first effort was by discussion and argument, to diffuse such information among the people of the North, as to induce a majority of them, to rest satisfied with the existing system, which had been estab-

lished by the founders of the government, and which, it seemed to me, could not be materially changed without great violations of the Constitution, and at the same time inflicting immense social and pecuniary losses on the country. If the existing system were maintained, the natural increase of the slaves would, in less than a century, justify an extension of our territory, until we should occupy that portion of Mexico which bordered the Gulf, and ultimately Central America and the West India islands. The result of this movement would have been, that the civilized world could have obtained its cotton, sugar, rice, coffee, and other tropical productions, on the best terms that it was practicable to furnish them. The benefit, in a material point of view, obtained by the Northern States, would have been even greater, than that of the South. Intelligent Northern men, who were neither abolitionists nor manufacturers, often admitted this. Even Gerritt Smith (the only abolitionist that I ever knew, whom I regarded as honest,) said in a speech at Richmond, Virginia, since the war, that slavery was like a cow with her head in the South and her body in the North, and that "while the South fed her, the North milked her."

If this system had been carried out, the negroes would not only have been far better off materially, than was their race in Africa, but their condition would have compared most favorably with the laboring population of many European countries, and it was immeasurably superior to that of the East Indians and Coolies, who were killed by the million annually, through the operations of Great Britain.

Secondly; on finding that this result could not be attained by discussion, I endeavored to induce our government to meet the insidious, and most dangerous system of warfare, that Great Britain was waging against us, by an open war on her. In that event the Abolitionists would, as her organs boasted, have taken her side in the contest, and thus like the old Federal party, but in a much greater degree, they would have been rendered so odious, as to be harmless for half a century. Such a war while it would have been far less costly to us, in men and money, than was the late civil war, would have given us the British possessions north of us, larger in extent than our present territory. The whole North American continent might thus have been embraced within our dominions, and in less than a century, our population would have exceeded that of Europe. By maintaining our federative plan of government, and permitting the States to manage all local matters, our system could have been perpetuated without difficulty, and no empire that has existed, would have been comparable

to ours, either in its extent, its power, or in the vastness of the benefits it would have conferred on humanity.

The imbecility of the administrations of Pierce and Buchanan, rendered them careless about all questions of foreign policy, and instead, they weakly directed their attention, and that of the country, wholly to the domestic quarrel, and thus materially advanced and hastened the catastrophe.

In the third place; these two previous plans having failed, the effort was to unite the Southern States in feeling and action, so that they might, in an imposing manner, say to the North, "Let us come to a fair understanding as to this matter. If you are not willing to continue the system of our fathers, then let us part in peace and on fair terms." An appeal thus made, I thought, would have led either to a fair accommodation, or to a peaceable separation.

Fourthly however; if neither of these results could be attained, then the South being thus united, would have been able to protect itself by force of arms.

It seemed in the beginning of the year 1860, that we might fairly calculate on one of the two latter alternatives. Men of all parties in the South, began to see, that the North was in substance, as to its electoral vote, almost solidly united against our section, with a settled purpose, on the part of the leaders of the dominant party, to disregard the restrictions and limitations of the Constitution, and overthrow by force, if necessary, our social system. It was evidently practicable to unite the body of the South for defense. Clearly every principle of justice, and every motive of interest impelled us, thus to come together.

And yet, in the face of all these most powerful considerations, several persons, who from their former declarations, ought to have been expected to be the foremost in perfecting the union of the South, went deliberately to work to produce distraction and weakness, rather than strength. If many persons had labored for years to erect a great edifice, and at the moment when it was about to be completed, some of its pretended zealous friends, should industriously undermine and destroy it, such conduct on their part would find its parallel in the action of some of the pretended friends of the South at this period. So extraordinary was their conduct, so much was it at variance with the usual action of men thus situated, that we are reminded of the declaration, "the gods first make mad those that they intend shall be destroyed."

The tyranny and wickedness of Pharaoh, drove the Israelites out of the fat land of Goshen, into Palestine: while there, hewing wood and

drawing water for the Philistines, served to correct their wickedness and idolatry. The act of Judas Iscariot, gave to humanity its greatest blessing. The extraordinary combination of circumstances, which led to such momentous results in our recent history, seems to carry a conviction to the mind, that the actors were instruments prepared to effect such purposes. No mere numerical calculation of chances appears sufficient to account for such a line of action.

It seems so wonderfully strange that, in the same century, and in the same country there should exist in contact, and with opportunity to act together, two such men as James Buchanan and Jefferson Davis, so plausible, so insincere, so selfish, so resentful and vindictive that all considerations in opposition to the gratification of these feelings, were ignored; and at the same time so childishly feeble in action for good, and so absolutely destitute of all administrative ability. And then, that they should have been able to delude so many persons, and secure their co-operation; while Douglas, as their opponent, lost his temper and judgment entirely, and thus assisted their operations.

If all these concurring circumstances could be presented together, men's minds would find it almost impossible to resist the conclusion that the effects produced, have as overwhelming evidence in favor of their being Providentially directed movements, as any other recorded in profane history.

It may be all the better for us in the South so to regard it. Thus accepted we can bear it with more resignation, and again move forward with a higher heart, to recover all, and more than all, that we have lost. Though placed by our adversaries (who sought to give the negro race an advantage over us) in a worse position than were the Spaniards in St. Domingo, we have not succumbed as they did, but have maintained our upright attitude.

Remember that after so many of our best men were slain in battle; after our territory was so wasted that it seemed impossible to escape starvation; after our State governments had all been purposely destroyed; after every vestige of civil administration had been obliterated, and after anarchy had thus been intentionally created among us; after governments had, by military force, been set up over us; after all our men who had been trained to public business were disfranchised, in order that we might be subjected to the control of the former slaves; and after adventurers had been encouraged to come in, and direct these emancipated slaves in their operations against us, and with their supe-

rior skill aid them in plundering us; when, I say, all these measures were resorted to, purposely, to destroy our manhood, and render us the most degraded specimens of humanity; if, in the face of all these difficulties, we have by our innate mental and moral force as a race, again been able to stand erect, and challenge a comparison, as true men and women, with the best varieties of the great Caucasian race, may we not well be of good cheer and look to the future with renewed confidence?

We now stand ready to assist all the best elements in the North in restoring constitutional government, and honest and economical administration of public affairs. And if, as I suggested to the Confederates at Davidson College, we will all, but for a few years, labor as earnestly as we did during the civil war, we can present to the view of the civilized world, a state of material prosperity, as well as of high moral tone, that any community may be proud to exhibit.

Again, we should endeavor to repress all feelings of anger against the majority of the people of the North. From the beginning of the government slavery was the subject of contention. The discussion of a question of its nature, appealing to feeling as much as to reason, necessarily became exciting. Though in calmer times the wise govern countries, yet during periods of great excitement, the extreme men always lead the masses. As those rather remarkable for violence of feeling than statesmanship, controlled the immediate movements, which precipitated the struggle on our side, so in the North men of more violence than principle directed the masses there.

When the war suddenly ended, as they had suffered severely from our efforts, they evidently at first dreaded a renewal of the contest by adversaries who had shown themselves so formidable. It was, therefore, not surprising that they wished to secure against all contingencies what they had, with so great an effort, won. The assassination of Lincoln, the vindictiveness of Johnson against us, in the first instance, and the later contest with him, whetted their anger and increased their violence. It is not strange, therefore, that extreme leaders, and selfish and greedy men, should have given shape and direction to their measures against us.

As the only issue which directly, and necessarily divided the sections, has been removed, we ought, on our side, to allow the recollections of the struggle to pass away. The energy and force with which they fought us give evidence of their vigor and manhood as a people. It is just as unfair to judge the majority of the people of the North

by the bad specimens we have seen among us, as it is for them to estimate us, as being like the noisy, malignant individuals here, who have only attempted to injure them by vituperative epithets.

From my own personal knowledge of the citizens of the Northern States, I am able to say that I have met no better specimens of humanity any where, than I have known in New England, the great Middle States, and in the Northwest. As they and we, had a common origin, are similar in race, language, and literature, and in the past, by joint efforts, achieved our independence, and established the most magnificent Republic that has existed upon the earth; and as we must in future, have a common government, and similar institutions, it would seem to be a high duty of every wise and good man, both in the North and in the South, to cause all the painful memories of the past to be forgotten. In this mode we can defeat the efforts of selfish and unprincipled demagogues to keep the country excited, that they may, by fanning the passions of sectional hate, acquire for themselves positions, to which their merits do not entitle them. And we may thus at no distant day, restore the administration of public affairs, to what it previously was in the brightest days of our past history.

SCHEME OF NATIONAL CURRENCY.

[So great is the present financial distress in the country, and such is the utter prostration of its general business that the following papers are presented. Upon the coming in of General Taylor's administration, in 1849, attention was directed to the condition of the currency. The State bank system was in operation, and though under it a currency was furnished sufficient to supply all local demands, yet those who traveled sustained some losses. North Carolina notes were two per cent. below par in New York sometimes, and those from States in the southwest, suffered a still greater depreciation.

The attention of the Secretary of the Treasury was directed to the subject of the best plan of improving the currency, and among other schemes it was proposed that the sub-Treasury should be converted into a bank of issue. Feeling, in common with most men of that day, averse to any institution that seemed to have a resemblance to a national bank, my attention had been directed to the subject.

Having had a conversation with Mr. Simeon Draper on the subject, at his suggestion, I put my views in the form of a letter to him, which he caused to be published in the *Courier and Enquirer*, of New York, and which was copied into the *National Intelligencer*, from which it is now reproduced.

It must be borne in mind that twenty-eight years ago, when this publication was made, the experience of the people of the United States was far less than it is at present. Nevertheless, many of the prominent features of our present system are substantially presented in it. But there are two striking differences between the plan then considered and our present system. In the first place, that did not propose to interfere with the then existing system of State banks. The main object was to furnish a currency, which should maintain a par value everywhere, as auxiliary to the existing system. In the second place the Treasury notes of the government were to be receivable for all dues to it, from whatever source they might come. That fact would have rendered them of equal or greater value than specie.

The doubt expressed, as to whether or not we might always have outstanding bonds enough of the United States to sustain a circulation of twenty millions of Treasury notes, is one that does not trouble us at present. Certain sentences that are italicised present suggestions of conditions that are now felt practically in most parts of the country:]

ASTOR HOUSE, October 8, 1849.

DEAR SIR:—Your favor was received a day or two since, and it gives pleasure to comply with your request that I would present in writing the outlines of the plan referred to in our conversation of last week.

While it is conceded by every body that the existing financial system must be changed in some respects, there seems to be a very general impression that the alterations necessary to meet the wants of the Government and of the community should not be accompanied by any great, radical, and sudden change of system. The plan referred to by me may perhaps be sufficiently understood, if stated concisely, in the following mode:

The Government should issue a certain amount of Treasury notes, (say ten or twenty millions, to be determined by law,) upon the following conditions :

State banks or individual bankers to deposit with the Treasurer of the United States the existing stock of the United States, bearing interest, &c.; the Treasurer in that event passing over to the banker making the deposit an equal or nearly equal amount of these notes. If thought advisable, it might be provided that the stock so deposited should be received from residents of the different States in proportion to their federal population. Should more than this amount be offered from a State, then the same to be scaled proportionally, as in case of subscription to joint-stock companies. Should there be a deficiency from any State, then that amount to be accepted from other quarters. Upon this being done, and the Treasury notes being turned over to the individual bankers, each person or corporation to make the necessary endorsement on the notes so received, to identify them sufficiently, and then be allowed to put them in circulation, as bank notes usually are; such person, however, to be required to redeem these notes with specie on their presentation. Should he fail to do so in any instance, then, after protest, the note or notes to be sent to the Treasurer of the United States, and he authorized, after waiting a certain number of days for redemption by the person or corporation liable, to sell the stock so deposited, and redeem all the notes so issued by that person, on presentation. It should then be provided that all Treasury notes so issued should be receivable throughout the United States in payment of the public dues.

To illustrate the matter more fully, let us take an individual case. After the passage of the law, one of your State banks, or a private individual, is supposed to deposit one hundred thousand dollars' worth of United States stock with the Treasurer. As the Government stock is worth much more than par just now, it might perhaps be perfectly safe for the Treasurer to turn over to such person one hundred thousand dollars in Treasury notes. If, however, it should be apprehended that the stock in any contingency might fall in value so much as to be below par, then it might be prudent to hand over rather less than the sum in notes. The individual, after paying the Government the expense of engraving and preparing the notes, and after making the proper memorandum or entry on each bill, so as to make it appear that it had been issued and must be redeemed by him individually, to be allowed to put the same in circulation as bank paper usually is. These notes I would have receivable in payment of all public dues throughout the United States. Should one of them, on presentation to the individual banker, not be redeemed in specie, then, after protest, it might be transmitted to the Treasurer, and he, after giving notice to the banker the number of days required, to be authorized to sell the original stock deposited by that person and redeem all the notes bearing his signature. Until, however, he should be thus in default, he should be allowed to receive the interest on his stock thus deposited, at such times as he is already entitled to have it.

The Treasury notes thus issued would readily circulate, and in fact must have the highest credit; because, in the first place, the person or corporation issuing them would be bound to redeem them in gold or silver, on presentation; because, secondly, United States stock of greater value was pledged for their redemption; and because, thirdly, they would be received at par by the Government throughout the United States. In fact, I take it that they must have the advantage of any

paper heretofore issued. The United States Bank notes had a high degree of credit, because the corporation was bound to redeem them in specie, and because they were receivable by the Government ; but they lacked the additional advantage of having United States stock of greater value than the whole circulation pledged for their redemption. The Treasury notes issued heretofore by the Government have sometimes been below par, because they were not redeemable in specie on presentation. It is obvious, therefore, that these notes would have higher claims to the confidence of the community than either United States bank bills or Treasury notes have heretofore had. It seems to me, therefore, that the holders of these notes would have every reason to be satisfied with them, and that they would constitute a sound circulating medium.

What would be the condition of the banker who issued them ? After his deposit of the stock with the Treasurer, he would still continue to receive the interest payable on the same, at stated periods, as he did previously. It would merely, for the time as it were, be placed for safe keeping with the Treasurer of the United States, and he might nevertheless make it the basis of his banking operations. In the case supposed, if, instead of one hundred thousand dollars in stock, he were required to hold that amount of specie, it is obvious that he would lose the interest on that sum during the time it was so kept, but in the case of the stock he would be in receipt of the interest as formerly. It is true that he would be compelled to keep on hand a sufficient sum in specie to redeem such notes as might be presented ; but when it is remembered that those notes so secured, and receivable everywhere by the Government of the Union, would have the highest credit, and be sought everywhere, it seems almost certain that comparatively a small amount of specie on hand would be an ample safeguard against the contingency of any run on the banker. In fact, I have no doubt that such persons, after retaining a sufficient amount of gold and silver on hand, and after paying all the expenses incident to the business, would make handsome profits. If it should be thought that these profits might be unreasonably large, it should be remembered that no one would be injured thereby. The Government is already paying interest on its stock, and those persons who might borrow the Treasury notes of the banker would only pay him the same interest as they pay now for bank bills of less value. The benefits arising, therefore, would be the legitimate results of the system itself, which would not inflict a corresponding loss on any one.

If the stock so deposited should be sold by the owner, it would nevertheless in the hands of the purchaser remain subject to the lien. Should portions of it become redeemable, during the continuance of the system, then let other outstanding stock of the Government be substituted, so as to keep the circulation up to the limit prescribed by the law, as near as practicable.

The expense of putting the system in operation would be inconsiderable. When at Albany recently I made some inquiries with reference to your existing banking system in this State, which is substantially the same as that we are considering, the issues of the banks being founded on the stocks of the State and of the United States. Instead of a uniform plate for all issues, however, I learned that each bank selected its own form of note, and that they were merely signed by the registers of the State

before delivery to the bank for circulation. The only reason assigned to me for preferring this to the other mode was, that if the plate were once successfully counterfeited the mischief would be greater, because a greater number of notes of that form would be in circulation, and it would therefore be more difficult to get in the entire issue, if it should be found necessary to do so. When, however, there is a variety in the forms of the notes outstanding, the chance of a successful imitation of some of them is increased, while it is more difficult for the public to learn the characteristic marks of a number of different plates than it would be to know a single one; and hence individuals would more frequently be deceived by imitations when there was a variety of notes in circulation. In fact, I am not aware that much inconvenience or loss has occurred heretofore in consequence of the Treasury notes of the Government having been counterfeited. Whether, however, it would be best to have one or many forms for the notes, it is not material now to inquire. My object in making reference to your State system, which has succeeded so well, was simply this: The amount in circulation is about ten millions, yet I was told by Mr. St. John that, after charging the cost of engraving the notes to the individual bankers, the expense to the State of having them signed by the registers, &c., was not above six thousand dollars. A large number of the notes thus issued are one and two dollar bills, and it is his opinion that, if none of the notes were below five dollars, twenty millions worth might be issued at the same cost. It is obvious, therefore, that this item of expense, whether borne by the Government or the individuals, is too trifling to be considered.

What would be the effects of this system if put in operation? It is the opinion of everybody that the present Sub-Treasury needs modification. The public complains, especially, that large amounts of specie are stowed away in the vaults of the Government, to the detriment of the community, which is thus deprived of its use; and, secondly, that the Government, in addition to the trouble of counting and keeping the gold and silver, is subject to great inconvenience and expense while transporting such funds from point to point in the United States. These two causes of complaint would, in a great degree, be removed by the adoption of this plan. The notes thus issued would be capable of taking the place, in the coffers of the Government, of an equal amount of specie, and could be conveyed with facility by the public agents to the point where they were wanted. That the Government needs some other modifications of the Sub-treasury law is not doubted, but their adoption would not interfere with this system in any way.

As compared with a United States Bank, it has already been said that these notes would have higher claims to credit than the bills of that institution had. There would be this further advantage, too, in favor of the new plan: As the credit of the United States Bank depended mainly on the amount of specie in its vaults in proportion to its circulation, whenever there was a pressure in money matters the bank was obliged to call in its notes in self-defence. It thus happened that, at the time when the distress of the community most required its assistance, it was obliged, in some degree, to withdraw its accommodations, and thereby aggravate the financial sufferings. But the Treasury notes thus issued, relying for their support, not on the specie alone, but also,

and in fact mainly, on the Government stock, would not have their credit affected to the same, perhaps not to any extent. Even if the amount should be twenty millions, which, according to my present recollection, is considerably more than the circulation of the late United States Bank was at any time, still there might be such an amount of United States stock pledged as to guaranty the redemption of the notes, under any probable or possible depression in its value. This could obviously be done, in establishing the system at the outset, without reducing the profits of the bankers below a fair rate. These notes would, I have no doubt, be kept outstanding, and in active circulation, at times of the greatest pressure. Should such be the case, it is evident that the existence of twenty millions of this sort of currency, steadily and at all times of pressure, would naturally benefit the country by diminishing the relative change in the whole amount of money caused by the fluctuations in the quantity of specie and bank notes which occur from time to time.

Besides, it used to be charged upon the late United States Bank that when it wished to produce a pressure and panic it would curtail its discounts at one point and enlarge them in other quarters, and thus keep up its business to the same extent. Whether it so acted it is not now material to enquire; but the fact that it had the power subjected it to suspicion and odium. But, under the system we are considering, there would be no connexion whatever between the bankers at the different points, no more in fact than there is now between the State banks and merchants in different quarters of the Union. Each would, on the contrary, do his business singly, and without concert with any other person or corporation.

This system would also not be in any respect liable to the objections made against a Government bank. The Government would have no power to make loans or accommodations of any sort to individuals or corporations. Its office would be simply ministerial, and confined to preparing and delivering the notes to the individual bankers, and in the event of any one of them failing to redeem his notes it would simply sell his stock and redeem them.

It is obvious that the Government would not by this system have any new or dangerous powers conferred on it.

One immediate effect of the measure would doubtless be seen in an increase in the value of the United States stocks.

This ought rather to be desired, since it is advantageous to every Government to keep its credit in the highest state, it being thereby able to borrow, when necessary, on better terms.

It is sometimes apprehended that if the currency should be expanded, in a short time thereafter, in consequence of the increase of credit and business generally, a revulsion must occur. Undoubtedly such would be the result if a stimulus should be applied for a time and then suddenly withdrawn. Such has been the case several times in our history. But nobody has any apprehension that if, on account of the opening of the California mines, or any other occurrence, there should be a great addition to the money of the world, and in consequence thereof an extension of credit and traffic generally—nobody fears, I say, that this state of things would be followed by any disastrous revulsions in business, be-

cause the gold and silver thus obtained, instead of being suddenly withdrawn, would remain as a permanent addition to the currency. So if, by the means of the system we are considering, an addition to our currency should be made, founded upon specie and Government stocks, and thereby a fresh impulse be given to business, there would seem to be no reason to apprehend a revulsion while the system continued. It would be mischievous undoubtedly to terminate it suddenly. This, however, might be easily avoided by the Government. Even, if all the stock was about to be taken up and the public debt paid off entirely, the treasurer might be authorized to re-issue portions of it, making it redeemable in portions at regular periods for a few years, so as to terminate the system without any shock to the community.

It is generally conceded that the present financial scheme does not meet the wants of the Government or of the community, yet it is not proposed to return either to a United States Bank or to any other of the old systems. A measure partaking of some of the qualities of these systems is most likely to be adopted. The collision of parties and the force of circumstances will probably generate a better plan than the former ones, just as the constitution of the United States is regarded as a more perfect instrument than any of the single minds engaged in producing it was able to make. *All the elements of the proposed plan are already in existence.*

The Government has a large amount of stock outstanding, and will, in the nature of things, doubtless continue to have, for a long series of years. Treasury notes have also been issued by successive Administrations, and have been countenanced by both political parties. The most striking difference between the notes thus recommended to be issued and the former ones, consists in this, that it is now proposed to provide a fund to ensure their redemption in specie at the will of the holder—an advantage of which the former notes were greatly in want; this furnishing indeed the strongest objection made to their issue. It is only necessary to connect the issue of Treasury notes with the already existing stock, in the manner suggested, and the system is complete.

I have thus, in compliance with what I understood to be your desire, in this hurried manner, presented the outlines of the plan. Not supposing it necessary to consider the details minutely, I have endeavored to present, in the most concise manner, a general idea of the system. I am disposed to think well of it, because every person to whom I have presented it, for months past, has entertained a favorable view of it.

I have the honor to be, very sincerely, yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

S. DRAPER, Esq.

NOTE.

Intelligent bankers in this city assure me that if the ten per cent. tax, which prevents the existence of State banks were removed, they would be able to lend money with greater advantage to their institutions at five per cent., than they can now realize, and this without issuing more than two to one, instead of three to one, which was formerly found safe in our State. Undoubtedly, the frightful suffering from the contraction now being produced by the action

of the government might be alleviated in this manner. Or if the government were to increase its volume of Treasury notes, and make them receivable for all dues, it might even thus arrest the present pressure and give relief to the country.

[Being in the city of New York in the autumn of 1873, and but a few weeks after the commencement of the "panic," I, in consequence of a conversation with a gentleman connected with one of the great dailies of that city, prepared a paper on the subject of the currency, which I was anxious to get before the public, prior to the State election to occur in a few days. On consultation, the managers of the paper declined to insert it, and it is offered now, not as a publication of that period, but because it contains some statements that may be worthy of present consideration, by reason of their connection with the subject of currency.

Though it was then said that we had "touched bottom," and though this statement has been repeated from time to time in almost every month for the last three years, it is manifest that the country has been continually falling, deeper and deeper, into distress and bankruptcy. Nor is there any well founded reason to doubt but that we shall continue to fall with an accelerated velocity, unless the government will change its action.]

NEW YORK, November 1, 1873.

I read some days since, with much disappointment, Senator Boutwell's lecture on the "Finances of the Country." Its statement of the causes of the present unfortunate condition of monetary affairs is meagre and unsatisfactory in the extreme, and the remedies suggested anything but encouraging. Alarmed as the public mind is by widespread financial distress, it is in a proper condition to consider the whole subject, and look for substantial remedies. A plain statement of facts and a clear presentation of the obvious principles suggested by them, may tend to enlighten the public judgment.

In the first place, to what causes are we to attribute the present disastrous condition of the country? By apprehending these clearly we may be able to find the appropriate remedy, as the physician ascertains the cause of the suffering of his patient before he attempts to prescribe. Unquestionably the chief cause of the present suffering is the destruction of capital in the late civil war. Yet this great fact is seldom adverted to, or sufficiently appreciated. Let us for a moment consider its magnitude. If to the recognized debt of the United States at the close of the war, there be added the sums already paid by the government, and by States, and municipalities, and individuals, the whole amount can hardly be estimated at less than four thousand millions, (\$4,000,000,000). Though the South may not have had half as many men in the field as the United States had, yet the cost of maintaining them in their isolated and straightened condition was so much greater per man, that their debt and expenditures cannot fairly be estimated at less than two thousand millions, (\$2,000,000,000).

In the contest, there were at least one million of men killed, or so disabled as to render them non producers. We may approximate the

industrial loss thus sustained. In the year 1860, a slave physically fitted to be a soldier, that is, one of the constitution and age from which soldiers were selected, could have been readily sold in the Southern States for fifteen hundred dollars. The price of labor, too, was then lower in the South than it was in the North. There can be no doubt but that the white men of the country, many of them, too, being highly skilled laborers, and possessed of superior intelligence, were worth quite as much pecuniarily to the country. Certainly their labor would average in value more than ninety dollars per annum, this being the interest at six per cent. of fifteen hundred dollars. In other words this million men had a value of not less than fifteen hundred millions of dollars, (\$1,500,000,000).

In the next place, it must be remembered that, in the two armies combined, for the period of four years, the aggregate of the men employed in the war, and thus rendered unproductive to the country, would not, on an average, fall below one million. At home their labor would probably have been worth at least one dollar per day, while in the army they received perhaps forty cents. The difference between these sums, sixty cents per day for each, will, in four years, for the whole million amount to more than seven hundred million dollars.

Again, the destruction of property in the Southern States, when we consider the desolation of farms, the burning of houses, factories, and loss of live stock, farming utensils, and all other kinds of personal property, and the labor of four years, for which Confederate bonds and notes were no compensation, the loss in the South was much more than one thousand millions, (\$1,000,000,000). It is difficult to make even an approximate estimate of what the North lost on the sea. Some ships were captured, many kept unemployed, or transferred with loss to foreigners. When the war began we had one-third of the shipping of the world, and seemed about to surpass Great Britain in tonnage. If we attribute one-half of our great loss to the war, and the other to the protective tariff, the injury is immense. Mr. Boutwell estimates the earnings from transportation on the seas at one hundred million dollars, of which, he says, three-fourths go to foreigners at this time. The whole loss to the country in maritime operations since 1860, must amount to several hundred millions.

Leaving, then, out of view all such considerations as to whether we have not also lost by the crippling of other kinds of industry, and the question whether the liberated slaves produce as much as they did in their former condition, there can be no doubt but that the entire pecuniary loss to the country caused by the war, was little less than ten thousand million dollars, (\$10,000,000,000).

Some persons imagine that the expenditures made were, in fact, a mere change of property. It is undoubtedly true that individuals, in many instances, made large profits, but in the aggregate of this vast expenditure, such items are comparatively small. The bulk of this expenditure is an absolute loss to the country. If I give a man ten dollars to make me a pair of boots, I have an equivalent for my money and he has realized ten dollars by his labor, so that the country has

thus gained. But if I pay him the ten dollars to fire a cannon as a salute on my birth-day, then, as I have no substantial equivalent, though the man has been compensated for his labor, the community has only ten dollars, instead of twenty as in the former case. The money spent in war was a loss of wealth to the country less obvious, because by the creation of a large debt the payment of which was postponed. The weight of that debt, in part, now oppresses the community.

In view of this condition of things, what ought to have been the policy of the government? Clearly, by all the means in its power to alleviate the condition of the country. When a surgeon examines a man badly wounded, he recommends quiet and stimulants. What would have been thought of one who should impose on the wounded man the same amount of labor that is usually required of a robust one? Yet that is just what the government did with the country. During the war, to enable it to bear its burden, the government necessarily, as well as wisely, expanded the currency. At its close, sound policy required that the currency should have retained its expansion, until the country, through the industry of the people, recovered strength, and the citizens had discharged most of their debts incurred during the period of inflation. If a debt, was contracted when gold was at a premium of fifty, be paid when gold is at ten, it is clear that the debtor pays thirty or forty per cent. more than he agreed to pay.

The government, however, in violation of all sound principles, began at the close of the war, a system of sudden and violent contraction. Its whole effort seems, from that period to the present, to have been to reduce the currency as rapidly as possible. Instead of being content merely with paying the interest on its debt, and leaving the principal to be met when the country had recovered its full strength, it has made the greatest efforts to pay large amounts of the principal. To discharge a six per cent. debt, it has been taking from the people money worth to them ten or twelve, as the rates of interest in most parts of the country prove. By its contraction of the volume of the currency, it has been crushing the debtors by compelling them to pay much more than they in fact equitably owe. Its action is in effect, what would be that if an act of Congress, obliging all debtors to pay from twenty to an hundred per cent. more than they owe, according to the ages of their several debts. A large portion of the indebtedness of the country, though its form may have recently changed, was contracted when gold was worth fifty and even one hundred per cent. more than it now is. The action of the government is thus crushing the debtors who, of course, are the weakest portion of the community and most in need of aid.

After the close of the great European wars, in 1815, many years elapsed before Great Britain could resume, and the process was attended with great depression. So it was with us after the war of 1812. Those among us who as bondholders and moneyholders, are profited by the contraction, refer to such facts as these to prove that a depreciated paper currency injures greatly a country. They attempt to substitute effect for cause. They might as well pretend that lying in bed in the day time made men sick, because it was seen that men in

bed in the day time were often sick, while those that were well stood on their feet. From necessity during the war, the United States suspended specie payment. The reasons for that suspension exist still, though in a less degree, and cannot be ignored without inflicting great suffering on the community. It is desirable that all sick persons should get up and go about their business, but the attempt to make them walk before they have recovered their strength would be mischievous. Those clamorous for resumption of specie payments allege, that the present suspension injures the working classes. They can prove nothing of the kind, and by such assertions are merely striving to mislead the public. While the amount of currency in circulation influences prices among us at home, gold is always the standard of exchange between this country and foreign nations. Such will ever be the fact whether the volume of our currency here is large or small. Our foreign trade was as well managed and as prosperous five years ago, when gold was above forty premium, as it is now, with gold at less than ten per cent. premium. In spite of all the attempts of the moneyholders to mystify the subject, it is clear that the volume of our paper currency at home, in nowise influences the prices of what we sell to countries, or buy from them.

A second potent cause of the present suffering arises from the fact that a very large portion of all the money of the country is held chiefly in this city, for purposes of speculation in stocks, &c., or what is commonly called gambling in gold, stocks, etc. This sum, variously estimated at from one hundred to two hundred millions, or perhaps nearly one-fourth of all the money of the country, is, for the time it is so held, as completely lost for all legitimate business purposes as if it had been destroyed in some of the great fires that have occurred. Suppose ten men, by putting in ten thousand dollars each, should make a pool of one hundred thousand dollars, and meet daily to gamble for it, is it not clear that this money would be as useless as if it did not exist. We have precisely such a condition, on a gigantic scale, in Wall Street now. The western farmer cries out, "for heaven's sake, send us money to enable us to move our grain before the canals are closed by ice, and thus relieve our distress." Wall Street replies, "we do not doubt your distress, and are sorry for it, but we need all the money for gambling purposes, or to meet liabilities incurred by gambling operations." The cotton planter, from the same cause, sees the value of his product diminished four or five cents in the pound, and all his profits lost. The manufacturer, for a like reason, must suspend operations and discharge his workmen, and the poor thus everywhere are compelled to suffer the greatest hardships. But for these gambling operations, as the crops of the country for the past year have been good, and the indebtedness of individuals has been diminishing from year to year, there ought to be a condition of comparative prosperity. These panics fall on the country at that period of the year when they do most mischief to the working classes. It was so in 1857, when the country was otherwise in the best condition. So, also, was it in 1869, when the Black Friday of September began the catastrophe. Whether these panics are cunningly provided or

arranged to take place at that time, so as to deprive the farmers and planters of their profits, and enable the middle men to clutch the fruits of their hard earnings, or whether they occur as the result merely of this accumulation of capital for gambling, they are equally destructive to the best interests of the country.

All civilized nations concur in the opinion that gambling is neither productive of wealth to the country, nor beneficial to individuals. I saw a Russian, at Wiesbaden, in a few hours winning at roulette sixty thousand dollars, but on the next day he lost it again, and all else he possessed, and became a bankrupt. In 1866, I met an acquaintance from the Southwest in this city, who told me that he had brought three hundred thousand dollars here, and in a few weeks had lost it all in these stock speculations. If it were publicly known that in a certain house in this city, a dozen or two young men were, by gambling rendered bankrupts, the police would in twenty-four hours come down on that house. If the city authorities refused to allow it to be interfered with, and that fact became known, such would be the indignation of the community that at the first municipal election, a new set of men would be placed in office. But while faro banks ruin a few hundred persons, Wall street gambling slays its tens of thousands.

These public operations not only tempt the incautious to embark in them, but they also seem to oblige others to engage in them at times to protect their own property from depreciation. A man who is a large owner of stocks, and whose ability to sustain his business operations, depends mainly on his being able to meet his engagements by sale of his stocks, may be compelled to enter the contest against these combinations that, for speculative purposes, seek to impair the value of his property. It is clear that if the immense sums thus employed were sent into the country to aid farmers and planters to forward their crops, to keep manufacturing establishments in operation, and to furnish the country merchants with the means of meeting their obligations to the wholesale dealers, there would be an advance in the foreign as well as the domestic trade, and an immense increase in the general prosperity of the country, no portion of which would derive so great an advantage as this city.

It is said, however, that it is impossible to put an end to this immense gambling operation. There is not the slightest ground for such an excuse. Any tolerable lawyer can draft in an hour, an act which if passed into a law, would break up this whole system. It may be said that in spite of existing legislation against private gambling, it is still secretly practiced to a small extent. A faro bank, it is true, may sometimes be concealed in an obscure room, but such an operation as that of Wall street could not exist without publicity. But it is said that we must acknowledge the right of people to buy and sell gold and stocks. This is undoubtedly true, but it is easy to so frame the law, as not to interfere with *bona fide* sales. We trust judges and juries to determine whether the appropriation of property is a felony, a simple trespass, a breach of trust, or a lawful taking. In like manner they are presumed to be capable of deciding whether a combination is a conspiracy or a lawful association. There have, in fact, been

many cases decided in which, combinations, by false statements and rumors to affect values, have been held to be within the reach of the criminal law. By breaking up this whole gambling system, legitimate trade would be rendered more prosperous, and the commercial morals of the country improved.

There is a third cause for the present suffering of the country to be found in the manner in which the existing banking system is conducted. When, for example, a planter in North Carolina had some money to spare, he deposited it in one of the national banks and received eight per cent. thereon. This money was lent out again by the bank at the rate of eighteen or more per cent. per annum. If banks were prevented from receiving interest on deposits, the effect would be that any person having money to lend, instead of putting it thus in bank, would, to secure interest on it, lend it to his neighbor on mortgage, or otherwise, and while he obtained thus for himself a fair rate, the borrower would save the extra ten per cent. he now gives to the banks. By such means as this, and the other advantages they possess, the banks are making enormous profits, and contributing largely to the impoverishment of the people.

The present high rate of interest is undoubtedly due in a great part to the want of a larger volume of currency. There is a second cause which seems to be strangely overlooked. It is owing mainly to the great destruction or loss of property caused by the war. In 1860 there were as many lenders as borrowers, and hence money could be had at fair rates; that is to say, at a little more than the average earning of the country. But in the South there are at this time far fewer lenders than there were before the war. On the other hand, there are now ten borrowers for one formerly. Men there are willing to pay enormous rates to save their property from sale on account of old debts, or to endeavor to recuperate their fortunes. Things are better in the North, but I have little doubt but that even there, there has been a diminution in the number who have capital to spare. There is no other remedy for this but that which arises from the increase of wealth. In rich communities, like Holland and England, because they possess a superabundance of capital, money is cheap.

While our present distressed condition is in a great degree due to the loss of capital in the war, it has been immensely aggravated by the action of the government in withholding a proper supply of currency, and by its aiding monopolies for the benefit of the wealthy, and consequently oppressing the working classes. What can be more monstrously unjust than the present system of tariff taxes? It has been made purposely for the benefit of the manufacturers. It is as cruelly unjust as the ingenuity of sharp and selfish men could frame it, for their own advantage. Whatever human wit could devise to relieve them from all share in supporting the government, and to enable them to extort the largest sums from the poorer classes, has been done.

If all duties were reduced to thirty per cent. and made uniform on all importations, the government would realize a larger revenue than it does from the enormous rates, while the people would make many

of their purchases for fifty per cent. less than present prices. If manufacturers cannot get along with a bounty of thirty per cent., ought they to continue business?

In 1816, Mr. Clay and Mr. Calhoun, while advocating the tariff, placed their support of it on the ground that it was fair to aid our manufacturing establishments during their infancy. But these infants are now more than fifty years old, and yet they are just as clamorous for government pap as they ever were. They endeavor to delude the people by constantly crying out that American labor ought to be supported, just as if the farmers and mechanics of the country were not as much laborers as anybody else. They insist that these very persons ought to be taxed to increase their own profits. Those branches of our manufactures, which can be profitably carried on in this country are highly prosperous, and will continue so under a fair tariff. What right have other enterprises, which cannot support themselves even with thirty per cent. bounties, to insist on higher rates? Oranges might be produced under glass in Massachusetts, but it is clear that if the labor and capital necessary to effect this, were employed in gathering the ice, which nature makes, and sending it to Florida, more oranges would thus be procured than could be produced in hot houses.

Mr. Boutwell, and others, complain of the large balance of trade against us, as a reason why the tariff duties should be kept so exorbitantly high. But with these present enormous rates, the balance of trade with foreigners, is much more against us now, than it was under the twenty per cent. tariff of 1860. In other words, taxing the whole community heavily, to keep up manufacturing operations, that cannot support themselves, will not enable us to pay our debts abroad. Those branches of our manufactures, such as iron, cotton fabrics, and many others that are well suited to our condition, will not only prosper of themselves, but are now, in fact, injured by a system, which by taxing heavily all things, increases the cost of living to the laboring classes.

If A is engaged in a business by reason of which he is obliged to lose money, it does not help the matter as far as the country is concerned, to authorize him to take money from his neighbor B, to make up his loss. With reference to the wants of the wealthy classes, in all countries their extravagance increases with their affluence. Old Romans used, to show the immensity of their wealth, to give dinners of ostrich brains and flamingo tongues, and Cleopatra's vanity was gratified by dissolving pearls in vinegar. Since the close of the war, the finances of the country have been managed in the interests of the money classes, over-looking the poor whose condition has been made worse.

We need, in the first place, more currency. Whether Congress ought to authorize the Treasury to sell legal tenders for bonds, when they are wanted, and again give out its bonds when there is a surplus of money abroad, or whether a better plan can be devised, I will not now attempt to discuss. Where there is a will there will be found a way to accomplish the object.

Again, the present banking system ought to give way to a more liberal one. If the government furnishes the circulation, why should

not all banking be managed by individuals, as other business is done? The public mind is confused on this subject because banks which issue their notes ought to hold means to redeem them. The present banks rest on the credit of the government bonds and legal tenders. Is not the foundation as strong as the superstructure? Why, then, in lieu of the present system, not allow all banking to be managed by individuals on the metallic and paper currency provided by the government? To supply the people with dry goods, private parties establish houses for their distribution. In like manner, leave it to individuals to collect money at certain points to be lent to borrowers. Many of the largest and best managed establishments in the world are private banks. It is said, however, that the government ought to compel banks to keep securities for the benefit of depositors. But when farmers deposit cotton or grain with their agents or factors for sale, the government takes no steps to protect them from loss. And yet, from the nature of these articles, there is a greater necessity for their being deposited with others than in the case of money. Individuals may keep their own money more conveniently at home than their produce, which must be sent abroad through agents. Even as banks are now managed, more men lose money by them, than is lost through factors and other agents selected by the farmers. If the money be, therefore, supplied, like other commodities, by individual dealers, and if the government will afford an adequate amount for circulation there will be fewer panics and more uniform prosperity. Of course, capitalists will not be able to maintain such enormous rates of interest as they do under the present system.

It was said in my hearing the other day that the national banks had such power that it was useless to struggle against them. The associations of the mechanics, and the great grange movements in the West, look as though the people are not yet ready to succumb to monopolies, however gigantic they may be. The present panic will greatly strengthen the popular cause. Where one wealthy firm suspends, a thousand laborers are thrown out of employment. The distress of the country makes men think and act. In spite of the advantages which the monopolies possess, a combined effort on the part of the people will insure reform.

Very respectfully, yours, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

[In connection with this subject, there is presented a publication which appeared in the *New York Herald*, of September 27, 1875:]

Correspondent—I represent the *New York Herald* and would like to obtain your views on the currency question and the Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York democratic platforms, and your impressions as to the probable action of parties in the coming Presidential contest.

General Clingman—My present engagements as a member of the Convention do not allow me time to give you an elaborate statement, but I have no objection to giving, concisely, my views on these points.

The real questions involved are not fairly presented to the popular mind. The people are misled and their minds are confused by the tactics of the contractionists or hard money men, as they call themselves, whose strategy prevents the people from seeing the real issue. They know that everybody prefers specie to inconvertible paper, and are continually crying out against rag-money. Their tactics remind me of a doctor who, on being called to see a patient with a fractured leg, or one prostrate with disease, should, instead of administering restoratives, discourse eloquently on the advantages of out-door exercise, walking, running, or riding a trotting horse. Every person is ready to admit the wisdom of such prescriptions for people in health. The condition of the United States resembles that of a man gradually recovering from a serious injury, and who must suffer a relapse if prematurely put on hard labor. The great pecuniary loss which the country sustained by the late civil war is not generally taken into the account. If you consider that, including advances made by States, towns and individuals, and what the government paid out during the war, with its acknowledged debt it makes \$4,000,000,000. The debt of the Confederate States was probably half as much, or \$2,000,000,000. Then 1,000,000 men, perhaps, were either killed or so disabled as to become non-producers. If these men were estimated as being individually worth only as much as an able-bodied slave sold for in 1860—\$1,500—there must be added a further loss to the country of \$1,500,000,000. Then there was employed on both sides for four years, nearly 1,000,000 men, who received for their labor not more than one-third of what they would have earned at home. Besides this there was an immense destruction of property in the South during the war, while the North sustained heavy losses on the sea in several modes. A fair summing up of all these items will show that the country, as a whole, must have sustained a loss of not less than \$8,000,000,000, and perhaps as much as \$10,000,000,000.

This immense loss was not so apparent, because of the very large issues of paper credit in different forms which took the place of the property destroyed, and thus created the impression that there had been little or no loss of wealth. The country overflowed with paper representatives of money, the whole amount of circulation being not less than two thousand millions. Of course, people made contracts on this basis, and, as the volume of currency was diminished, the debtor class found themselves under a burden which was constantly growing heavier. Thus a man who, ten years ago, borrowed what was equivalent to \$40 or \$50 in gold, is now, in addition to the interest, compelled to pay double that amount. Of course, the debtors are the weaker class and have the stronger claims for aid; but, in fact, the action of the government was against them and tended to increase their burdens. Had the volume of the currency been kept steadily at the same amount that it was at the close of the war, this condition would have been perfectly fair to both parties, and neither debtor nor creditor could have justly complained. But in truth the government rapidly contracted the currency, and thus virtually increased the debts of the people, making it harder for them to pay off their obligations. I was surprised to see how long the country held up under this rapid increase of the burdens of the people. Had the currency been reduced only one half, say to \$1,000,000,000, I believe the

country would have been able to stand up under it. But when the volume was reduced to only a third of what it had been, its back was broken, and the crash came. As an overstrain on a chain will cause its weakest link to give way, so such speculators as Jay Cooke first went under. Had the government then added \$100,000,000 to the legal tenders the panic would probably have been arrested; but the strain has been kept up, and link after link has given away. The wound inflicted on the credit and business of the country is now so deep that it will not be easily healed. Even strong establishments have collected their resources and are standing still from apprehension. Money cannot be obtained now for useful business enterprises. Banks, seeing that debtor after debtor is falling under the pressure, are alarmed and stand still, not knowing at what moment the force of the storm may strike them. Business is thus rendered stagnant, and laborers cannot be profitably employed. Many are living on their past earnings, while others are sinking into poverty and want, and this condition must continue and become worse unless an efficient remedy be applied. Though the evil first fell on the interior, it has reached to centres of trade. People feel that they are too poor to buy much of the country merchant, and hence the country merchants do not purchase largely of the wholesale dealers, and the great centres of trade are suffering. Moneyed men, apprehending justly that the bottom has not yet been touched, are holding on to their funds. The man who sees that he can now buy a lot in New York for half what it would have cost him five years ago is waiting in hope that next year he may be able to buy it for only a fourth of its former value. Capitalists stand still, hoping that better opportunities will present themselves for investment, and laborers are thus kept idle and in want. Applications on the part of the people for relief are met with denunciation. A leading advocate of hard money says that the man who calls for more circulation is dishonest—that he wishes to pay a hundred dollar debt with only \$80. But he insists that it is not only right to make a man who only owed \$80 now pay \$100, but that it is dishonest for the government not to compel him to pay the larger sum. The organs of the money interest say that debtors wish to pay their debts with rags. They forget that they, and the government acting in concert with them, scattered these rags over the country and induced the people to contract debts on a rag basis, and are now unwilling to receive them back again. If a year ago I had borrowed 100 pounds of rags, with a promise to pay 106 pounds, could my creditor rightfully insist that I should pay him gold instead? Or would it be fair for him to combine with other capitalists to destroy all the rags in the country so that he might compel me to pay him gold instead? This figure presents the real merits of the case. The people were encouraged to make debts in rags, and now they are to be required to pay them off in gold. The greediness of the money power has thus paralyzed the industry of the country.

Correspondent—Have you any further expression to make on this point—the banks for instance?

General Clingman—there is another great question to be considered; one which vitally affects the existence of our whole system of free government. General Jackson thought that the old United States Bank with its capital of \$35,000,000, was a power dangerous to popular lib-

erty; but our present national banks have a capital of \$350,000,000—ten times as much as the old institution had. Messrs. Clay, Webster and Calhoun dreaded a government bank, and said that it was most fortunate for the country that there was antagonism between the then government and the United States Bank. Now we have the immense capital of the national banks, ten-fold more powerful than then existed, closely allied with a government expenditure and official patronage nearly twenty times greater than it then was. It has, too, at its back the power of \$2,000,000,000 in the hands of bondholders and other creditors, who are making a common fight for it. This powerful combination has up to the present time, carried all its points and wielded the power of the government at its will. In the first conversation I ever had with Mr. Calhoun, he spoke with great apprehension of the fate of our free system in the event of the government being able to acquire the control of the money power of the country. Have not his fears been realized? Has not the government hitherto in its action been completely subservient to the money power? We have now before us not merely the question of pecuniary interest—that is overshadowed by the higher issue of liberty. The result of next year's contest will doubtless determine whether our present system of free government is to continue in substance as well as in name.

Entertaining such convictions, I, of course, feel the deepest interest in the coming elections in Ohio and Pennsylvania. The platforms of the democratic party, if not all that they should be, are in the right line of action. Of the probabilities of their success we must judge from the past. Since the so-called panic has become serious, the elections have generally been favorable to those opposed to the party in power. This was mainly due to the financial condition of the country. When matters are going on smoothly, the people are disposed to let the government remain in the hands of those in power; but when they sustain injury they endeavor to ascertain the cause—just as a man does not think it necessary to consult a physician as long as he feels well, but when attacked by pain he looks for a remedy. The attention of the masses having been called to the action of the government, they condemned it. To this cause mainly are we to attribute the great political changes that have occurred in the State elections. It was this that elected Gaston in Massachusetts. It is true there was said to be money enough in Massachusetts, but it was held by the few; nineteen out of twenty were in want, and, finding no employment to enable them to earn a living, manifested their dissatisfaction. It gave little consolation to suffering men to be told that General Butler and a few others had a super-abundance of money. The fact that a man's crib and barn were full of grain and provender would not console his live stock unless some of the contents could be obtained for their use. It is not singular that the party in power should have lost ground from such causes. Their overthrow would have been much more signal if their opponents had had the sagacity, the disinterestedness and the manliness to place themselves fairly and squarely on the true issue. Two or three bold speeches in the Senate, setting forth the truth of the causes from which the country was suffering, would have greatly increased the majorities against the administration party. Deprived as they were of the counsel of most of

those who should have been their leaders, the people understood the issue sufficiently to win the battle. Now, able men in Ohio, as well as elsewhere, are presenting the question to the masses, and I think they must win. They have truth and justice with them, and the interests of nineteen-twentieths of the people are on the same side. Against them is arrayed almost the entire money power of the country, which can to a great extent control newspapers and furnish orators.

It has struck me that the hard money organs are overshooting the mark in their mode of warfare. Feeling their cause to be on its merits weak, not content with cunning sophistries, they are profuse in the use of denunciatory epithets. They are constantly crying out rag money, affirming that all opposed to their views are dishonest; that a man who wishes debtors to pay only as much as they originally owed is no better than a knave, &c. On the other side it has gratified me to see with what patience the people of the country have borne the evils under which they are suffering. A similar condition of affairs would, in most parts of Europe, have produced a revolution, or at least uprisings and disturbances on a much larger scale than those in Pennsylvania. Our citizens, with the spirit of enlightened Americans are merely striving to find proper remedies through the ballot-box.

The hard money organs denounce as repudiators all who are against their ruinous policy of contraction. If a repudiation party should rise, it will be due to the denunciatory course of these organs that, in their profusion of epithets, are likely to excite the anger of the suffering masses. The people of this country are willing to pay every dollar of the national debt, but they think it ought to be paid in the manner least burdensome to them. It was a great mistake that the government did not content itself with paying merely the interest of the debt up to this time, leaving the principal to be discharged after the country had recovered from the losses of the war, and its wealth and population had been increased, so that the burden would have been rendered comparatively light. Paying the interest in gold would have brought the bonds up to par, and this ought to have satisfied men, who had originally bought them for half their face value. The bondholders and their allies, by insisting on more than this, and urging a policy as unjust as it is ruinous, may so irritate the masses as to lay a ground for a repudiation party. Men may rise up over the land who, by showing that the bondholders have already received more than the principal and interest of what they actually paid in gold, may so influence the minds of the people as to induce many to favor stopping further payments. Should any such strong party arise, it will be solely due to the greediness and insolence of the money power. Deprecating, as I do, any such contest, I trust that capitalists will be content, like Shylock, with the pound of flesh, and not also insist on having the life-blood of the country. It is idle for them to continue to push aside the real issue by cunning sophistries. They point to the fact that in England and in this country, when suspension of specie payments existed, business was not prosperous toward the close of those periods. In times of great trial, governments are compelled to resort to systems of credit.

Had not the United States in the late civil war drawn largely on its credit with the people, the war could not have been maintained on its

gigantic scale for a single year. Any striving now to pay off these debts too rapidly inflicts on the masses just such evils as were experienced in England from a like course. In their arguments they mistake cause for effect. Their error is like that of a man who should say that carrying crutches made men lame, because all the men he saw with crutches were lame. If our government had not resorted to a system of credit and expansion of currency it could not have moved at all. The suffering now experienced results from its attempting to throw away its crutches too soon. By allowing a longer time for recovery, the injury might be greatly lessened.

Correspondent—What is your idea, General, of the national bank system?

General Clingman—The present national bank monopoly ought to be discontinued, and a system of State banks allowed to take its place. For ten or fifteen years prior to 1860, we had as good a system of currency as we could reasonably expect to see. I doubt if the community lost as much under that plan, as it does under the present one. Indeed, in addition to liabilities of individual losses, the present national bank organization, besides its inordinate gains, is enabled to make so extensive combinations among its members as to place the business operations of the country under its control, and the debtor class at its mercy. Besides removing it, the government should, it seems to me, not only coin specie, but also furnish the paper needed for circulation. By making that paper receivable for all public dues, it could doubtless keep afloat a larger volume than we now have. To prevent depreciation, that paper should be exchangeable for government bonds at a rate of interest not above four per cent. In the first instance such paper should be exchanged for the present national bank notes, paid out for all its expenditures, except what it is bound to pay in specie, and in exchange for interest bearing bonds at a fair rate, until there was outstanding such a volume, as the wants of commerce and business required, to be lessened when necessary, by investment in bonds bearing a low rate of interest.

[The speech which follows is published because it discusses the currency question in the first part of it, and secondly for this reason: "Stump speaking," as it is often called, or addresses directly to the voters, is one of our most potent American institutions. During a great part of my life, I have been accustomed to practice it. From the day when, in the year 1835, I made my first speech as a candidate for the House of Commons in North Carolina, down to the present time, I have not written a single sentence to be used for such a purpose. It was my custom always to speak directly to the people as I would talk to an acquaintance. By so doing, one not only secures the attention of the audience, but he makes a far better impression than he can by any other mode.

Hence I would advise all beginners to adopt this practice from the start. Most persons can easily do this, and one who cannot, though he may make a successful lecturer, and even deliver eloquent orations, will never be able to

struggle in a hand to hand contest with an adversary, before a popular audience.

Again, I have seen, as most persons, doubtless, have also done, that after speaking two or three times, before different audiences, I could present my views with more point and force than on the first occasion. Especially is this the case where one is interrupted by a question, and rallies his faculties under the stimulus of opposition. In my own canvasses the best points were thus furnished by irritated combativeness.

After the delivery of the speech several gentlemen expressed a desire that it should be published for campaign purposes. To meet the issue of the forthcoming weekly paper, it was rather hurriedly prepared. With the exception of some little hits thrown in to enliven the audience, which were purposely omitted, the gentlemen who heard it said that the report in all respects corresponded with the speech as delivered. It may, therefore, be regarded as a specimen of a "Buncombe speech," made by a Buncombe man.]

SPEECH

DELIVERED AT HENDERSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, SEPTEMBER 12, 1876.

GENTLEMEN: Within the last twelve months I have been a representative in three Conventions, viz: that at Raleigh last autumn, called to amend our State Constitution; secondly, the Democratic Convention at Raleigh, which assembled in June, and nominated our excellent State ticket; and thirdly, the National Democratic Convention at St. Louis, which presented to the country Samuel J. Tilden and Thomas A. Hendricks as candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. I shall to-day offer to your consideration topics connected mainly with the action of the last of these Conventions. According to my usual custom, rejecting all mere ornament and rhetorical display, I shall address you directly, as a man in earnest speaks to a friend on a matter of great importance.

Wherever I go, gentlemen, I hear the complaint of hard times. Often it is said that the times are like they were in 1840. But in fact, in the year 1840 the depression and financial distress were not at all equal to what they are now. I was then an active canvasser in the presidential campaign, and remember well the state of affairs then prevailing. There was no such scarcity of money as we now see. Though the banks had suspended specie payments, yet North and South Carolina bank notes were only two or three per cent. under par in New York, while such Georgia notes as I collected in our western counties were fourteen per cent. discount at the North, ranging about with the average value of the present greenback notes of the United States government. Business then went on nearly as usual, and people did not suffer for want of the necessities of life in any part of the land. The condition of the country then bore the same relation to what we now witness as a panic or scare does to a serious wound.

Though the present pressure was at first most seriously felt in the West and South, it soon reached the Northern and Eastern States. It

is now probably felt more seriously in New England and New York than it is here. The South had already been prostrated and, like a man on his back, did not seem to have far to fall. Though we have little or no money, yet provisions exist here in sufficient abundance to supply the absolute wants of all classes, and but for old debts and present heavy taxes, we would not, as a community, be distressed. In the North, however, millions of people depend on daily employment for support, and having been in large numbers without occupation for a long period, extensive and frightful sufferings exist among them. In some of the States, hundreds and thousands collect together, and under the designation of "tramps" rob railway trains. You know that formerly European emigrants came to this country at the rate of nearly half a million annually, because wages were higher here than they were in the old countries. But so many men are out of employment now, and in a starving condition, than when some weeks ago in the city of New York, there was published an advertisement for a few stone cutters to go to Scotland to work, so many appeared that the streets around the building were blocked up, and the police were called in to keep order. The daily papers in that city state that thirty thousand men there, would gladly go across the Atlantic to earn a subsistence. For recruits in the army good mechanics, who were formerly accustomed to receive three or four dollars per day, offer themselves at the rate of thirteen dollars per month, or thereabouts.

But the present distress does not confine itself to the laboring classes and the poor, but is now pressing upon those who thought themselves rich. Many whose incomes have fallen short, in order that they may live as they formerly did, have mortgaged their dwelling houses to procure the means of keeping up their former style. Peter Cooper, one of the wealthiest, most intelligent and honored residents of New York, stated recently that half the houses in that city were under mortgages, and that when sold generally did not bring enough to pay the debts on them. When in that city frequently, as I have been during the present year, references were made to many costly houses, that were being sold for much less than half they would have brought three years ago. I might detain you for hours with details showing the distress and starvation prevailing. A similar condition exists in much of New England, and other portions of the Northern States. Some intelligent men make the estimate that there are a million of laborers out of employment, many of whom have exhausted their past earnings, and find subsistence with great difficulty. It is almost certain that notwithstanding the general industry of our citizens, which ought within the last three years, to have added greatly to the wealth of our country, the United States as a whole are poorer materially, than they were at that time, independently of the nominal shrinkage of values resulting from a diminished currency. This is due to the fact that capital has been unproductive, while laborers have been unemployed, and all classes to a great extent, have been eating up their former earnings.

The momentous question presents itself, to what are we to attribute the fact that, in a time of profound peace, and in spite of the gen-

eral industry and enterprise of our people, there is such a stagnation of business and so much suffering among the people? The Republican party has had, for the last sixteen years, the entire control of the government in all its departments. To excuse it from responsibility, its friends attribute the present state of the country to the late civil war. Undoubtedly an immense amount of capital was destroyed during the war which ought to have induced the government to deal as tenderly and gently with the people as its necessities would permit it to do. Its contrary action I shall presently show. But in fact that war ended more than eleven years ago, and until the past three years business was prosperous and the people were enjoying the comforts of life. Again, the organs of the party in power assert that the extravagance of the people is the sole cause of their distress. But wherever I have been, I find the people living on less than they previously did, and yet the times grow worse and worse from month to month. Neither of these excuses are sufficient to account for the remarkable condition of the country.

Gentlemen, the present suffering of the people, is due almost entirely to the action of the government of the United States. Our condition is the direct result of the line of action adopted and prosecuted industriously, by the government, and unless its policy be changed, that condition will steadily become worse as each year rolls on in its course. I now propose to establish the truth of these two propositions to the conviction of every gentleman who will give me his attention.

At the close of the late civil war the entire circulation, or paper credit of the country was fully equal to two thousand millions. Much of the government paper had been issued when one dollar of it did not represent forty cents in gold. Of course the people did their business on the basis of this circulation, and debts were contracted on it. If the volume of the currency had remained as it was, without change, this would have been perfectly fair to all parties, and the debtor would have paid to his creditor just as much as he owed. But the government adopted a policy which produced a rapid contraction of the currency, and greatly reduced the quantity afloat. This system was persevered in until the volume of the currency was reduced so that it was a little more than one-third of what it had been. The result was that in spite of the industry and energy of its citizens, the country could no longer stand the pressure. Its back was broken, and the crash, erroneously termed a *panic*, came. As the weakest link in a chain is the first to give way, so such speculators as Jay Cooke were the first to go under. Instead of taking warning, and arresting the crushing operation, the government pressed it forward as fast as possible, until it made the suffering general. Thousands who felt secure and looked with satisfaction on the downfall of *reckless speculators*, as they were termed, have in succession gone under. And yet the "*panic*" moves on devouring one after another, like Sinbad's great serpent, until it is becoming the question, who is to escape its jaws? Instead of having "touched bottom," as shallow men from time to time assert, the increased failures of the present year show that the country is failing faster than it has hitherto been doing.

But gentlemen, I must call your attention to the most remarkable public crime that has ever been committed by our government, perhaps I might say in view of the circumstances, by any civilized government. From the time of the foundation of our government, yes I may say from the times of the Patriarchs of the Bible, silver and gold have in all countries been regarded as precious metals, and in ancient as well as modern times have been used as money and performed its office among mankind. Our Constitution declares them to be money and provides that "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debt." They had both been used throughout the United States until the 12th day of February, 1873. On that day, an act of Congress was passed which declared that silver should not be a legal tender for any debt above five dollars. It was thus placed in a position similar to that occupied by copper and nickel. This act was passed without any discussion, or general notice to the people. In fact, members of the present Congress assure me, that when the bill, of which it was but a small part, was before the House, and it was proposed to let it go through without reading because it was a very long bill, relating mainly to the mints, the question was asked of the member reporting, as to whether it affected the status of silver, and that he answered that it did not. At any rate it was gotten through so surreptitiously and secretly, that President Grant seems to have signed the bill without any knowledge of this feature in it, for in a letter written to Mr. Cowdrey; ten months afterwards, he spoke in hopeful terms of our soon having two or three hundred millions of dollars in circulation, as the product of our great silver mines in the west. Many members of Congress, both senators and representatives, last winter assured me that they were not aware that there was such a law, until the discussion commenced on the subject after their arrival in Washington.

There were three reasons, each sufficient in itself, why no such measure as this should have been passed. In the first place, silver from the earliest historic times has been the money of the world. It is more stable in value than gold, and has been made money and a legal tender by the express words of our Constitution. Our people were accustomed to its use, and having both it and gold as money, or what is called the "double standard," they were better protected against fluctuations in the currency which might produce distress through sudden changes in the quantity of money afloat. This double standard tended to give stability just as a man stands more firmly on two legs than he does on one. The goose is the only animal I know, that stands on one leg from choice, and he has never been regarded as famous for political or financial wisdom. In the second place the United States contracted a debt of more than two thousand millions of dollars, and this debt was expressly made payable in gold or silver. As silver was at that time rather the cheaper of the two metals, the government could have paid its debt more easily in silver than gold, and yet silver was stricken down from its position as money. Recollect that taking a long average of years, silver has constituted more than half the money of the world. By this act, as far as our country is con-

cerned, half of the money of the world was destroyed, for silver and gold as money among civilized nations constitute the basis also of paper money. This act, by thus increasing enormously the burden of the country, was a great fraud and crime against the American people. Suppose that I was by contract bound to pay an hundred bushels of grain per year for the next ten years, and it was expressly understood that I might at my option pay either in wheat or corn, would it not be a great wrong to provide that I should not be allowed to pay in corn when it was the cheaper, but should be compelled to pay in wheat only? This gentlemen is the bargain that our government has made for us. Some attempt to excuse it by alleging that Germany has lately, following the example of England, demonetized silver. Germany having conquered France obtained a thousand millions indemnity, and expecting to get it in gold, demonetized silver. This act of greedy folly has by the change, produced so much distress among their own people, that they are now trying to retrace their steps. The very fact that silver had thus been made cheaper in Germany, furnished one of the best of reasons why we should retain it as money so that it might flow to us, and assist us in paying our heavy debt. If corn were scarce in this county, it would be a great advantage to you if it were abundant and cheaper in the adjoining county of Buncombe, so that you might obtain it with ease to satisfy your wants.

In the third place, the United States is the great silver producing country of the world, and, therefore, it is to our interest to give it as high a value as possible, and thus increase the amount of our own productions. England, on the contrary, is a great producer of gold from her Australian fields, while she has no great silver mines. In addition to this, she is the great creditor nation of the world, and wishes the rest of mankind to pay their debts to her in the costliest metal. She is wise enough to look to her own interest, and does not permit her statesmen to be seduced by bribes, or blandishments to betray her interests.

For what reason, then, was this act perpetrated, which is estimated to have added five hundred millions to the burdensome debt of our country? Men do not usually commit a great crime and inflict immense sufferings on their countrymen wantonly, or without some adequate cause. We owe as a people, more than two thousand millions, and the bondholders, mostly foreigners, and other creditors, will be benefited by receiving their payments in gold rather than silver. By getting the more costly metal, and at the same time making money as scarce as possible, they will be able to buy more of the property of the country with their gold. So, too, will all money holders and men who receive official salaries. Was it as General Banks, of Massachusetts, suggested lately in his speech in Congress, that the perpetrators of this crime were secretly operated on by these bondholders and their allies, and thus induced by stealthy fraud to increase the public and private debt of the country so heavily?

Remember, fellow-citizens, that when, in 1863, the volume of greenbacks, and other paper representatives of money was greatest, less than forty dollars in gold would purchase one hundred dollars in paper

money. Hence, a thousand dollar bond was purchased for only four hundred dollars in gold, and since that time the action of the government has caused every one of the bonds to be worth, in fact, more than one thousand dollars in gold. Besides getting interest on what they paid, at the rate of fifteen per cent. in gold, for six per cent. on one hundred is equal to fifteen per cent. on forty, these bondholders have secured a property worth two and one-half times as much as they paid for it. What justice, then, is there in thus giving them at the expense of the people a still greater sum? If I were to purchase from a man in distress for money, for one hundred dollars, a horse worth two hundred and fifty dollars, would it not be a monstrous wrong for me, in addition to the advantage I had obtained over him to seek by artful strategy to obtain from him an additional sum? And yet when a majority of the Democratic members, a few weeks since, were attempting to repeal this iniquitous act, and do justice to the people by restoring silver to its place as money, they were denounced by the friends of the bondholders as attempting to commit a great fraud upon the country. It was said that as the bondholders had secretly gotten the advantage of the people three years ago, they ought not now to be obliged to give it up. It mattered nothing that the right which the people had enjoyed for nearly a century, guaranteed by the Constitution of their country, and on the faith of which they had contracted debts, had been stealthily taken from them. Oh, no! to take advantage of the people, and exact money from them above what they originally owed, was all right, but it was a monstrous fraud to restore them justice. If a man had secretly stolen my horse three months ago, and I to-day were to find him in the possession of the thief, and were to attempt to reclaim him, and that thief were to exclaim, "Oh! you must not take this horse from me, I stole him while you were asleep so secretly that you knew nothing of it. I have had him in possession, and have gotten credit with my butcher and others by parading him in public, and you will commit a great fraud on me if you take him back." Such declarations on his part would not present an exhibition of more impudence and effrontery, than are many declaration of the advocates of this silver fraud.

If, gentlemen, the house of any of you before me, was levied on for the trifling sum of ten dollars, and you carried to the sheriff ten dollars of the silver coin of the United States, it would be no more a legal payment than if you carried up a bar of lead or iron. It is now no more money by law than would be ten bushels of wheat, which your creditors might, at his option, take or refuse.

After this deep distress had fallen on the country, the party in power brought forward as a measure of relief their resumption act. It in substance is intended to provide that on the first of January, 1879, or a little more than two years hence, the government shall take out of circulation all the greenback notes now afloat, by exchanging gold interest bonds for them, or paying them off in coin, so that there will be no paper money in circulation except national bank notes. But as the act also compels the national banks to resume specie payment, it will greatly diminish, if it does not in fact, destroy their circulation

entirely. These banks are by law compelled to keep besides government bonds, twenty-five per cent of lawful money, and after the greenbacks have been taken up, silver having already ceased to be money, gold is the only thing left for them. As gold is too scarce in the world for them to be able to procure much of it, they have been obliged to commence calling in their circulation. Under this operation a large number of their notes have been called in. The *National Republican*, the organ of the administration at Washington, in its issue of the 4th of the present month, in presenting the weekly financial exhibit shows that for the last week ending Saturday 2d, there had been forwarded to the Treasury for redemption \$4,174,000, against \$3,479,000 for the corresponding week of last year. From this it appears how the national bank notes are being called in, per week, and that the velocity is an increasing one from year to year. All the notes may be called in within the time prescribed. Such is the pressure on them owing to the menace held over them by the resumption act, that banks in this State will not lend money for short periods at 12 per cent. If any man in large business were obliged to pay every debt he owed on a given day not far off, he would be afraid to lend, but on the contrary would endeavor at once to collect all due him. Such is now the situation of some two thousand banks with an aggregate capital of \$350,000,000, or ten times that of the old United States bank, the contraction of which in a small degree, only when the deposits were removed from it, was sufficient to produce the great panic and distress experienced in 1834.

A number of the national banks have already been compelled to wind up their business entirely. One of the national bank presidents at Raleigh, who had been engaged in similar business before the war, assured me last October that he was satisfied that there was not even then one-fifteenth as much currency furnished to our State as we had in 1860. In other words, for every dollar then furnished to our people, in the year 1860 we had \$15. Then, too, all our bank notes were as good as gold. If we need now, as I believe we do, about as much currency as we used before the war, is it strange that the present suffering should exist?

But this, gentlemen, is not all the painful story. The government is, also, as speedily as it can, calling in its greenback notes. The candle is burning rapidly at both ends, and they will be able to consume it entirely within two years. Then we must depend on gold alone for circulation. Will this, gentlemen, answer your purposes?

The highest reliable estimate places all the gold in the United States at \$140,000,000. Of this amount the government requires to pay its interest on the bonds and for the sinking fund, \$130,000,000, leaving about \$10,000,000 only for the people of the United States with which they must pay all their debts and taxes.

Let us try to realize our situation when brought to this condition. The taxes of Buncombe county last year amounted to \$28,000. Intelligent men believe that outside of a little gold some of the banks are compelled to hold, there is not in the State among the people probably, gold enough to pay the taxes of this single county, to say nothing of

the rest of the State, and all the debts the people owe to each other, besides the enormous sum of Federal taxation, of which I shall speak presently. If the taxes of the present year were collected in gold only, a single man with an hundred thousand dollars in gold might become the owner of the greater part of the property of the State.

This fellow-citizens, is not exaggerated, but a picture that confronts us in the near future if our progress towards it be not arrested. Mr. Hayes, the Republican candidate for the Presidency, declares that he is in favor of coming to this condition of affairs by the first of January, 1879, unless some one will show him a shorter road to reach the same point. With these great facts staring us in the face like the noon day sun, men say they cannot account for the *hard times*. Suppose that a man with his hands tied, lay on his back, and we saw a rope about his neck, and two other men holding the ends of the rope and pulling it strongly, and saw that the prostrate man was panting and flushed in the face and struggling with his feet, and you heard it said, "the man pants and struggles because the rope is not pulled tight enough." Yes, if the rope be pulled tighter, he will cease to breathe hard, and no longer struggle with his feet, for he will be dead. But as a strong man will struggle terribly to save his life, so must the people of this great country struggle, to save themselves from destruction.

Gentlemen, I seek not to alarm you, but when I "speak the words of truth and soberness," I know that to one who did not see the facts, they would seem like the exaggerations of a Tiberius Grachus.

Is it not strange that the government should be anxious to call in the greenback circulation, which the people are glad to use, and on which it does not pay any interest? If the government would receive them for all its dues, those greenbacks, like the treasury notes issued in the times of Van Buren and Polk, would be equal with gold. To pay its coin interest it would then be much easier for the government to buy one hundred millions of coin than it now is, for the merchants to purchase two hundred million of gold to pay tariff taxes. The fact that the merchants are compelled to purchase this large sum of coin to pay the government, which will not receive its own paper, is the principal reason why gold is so high in this country. I ask again, why is it, that the government is so anxious to get rid of notes on which it pays no interest, and issue instead bonds on which it must pay interest in gold coin? I can imagine but two reasons, the first of which is, that it can thus favor those whom it wishes to befriend, by letting them have bonds, which they can sell at a profit in Europe. Secondly, by thus sending money to pay the interest on these bonds, and also by removing all the greenbacks from circulation, they will make money scarce here, and thus enable the few who hold money to obtain a large amount of the property of the country for it. Are we not now to meet the attempt, to make the United States a great plantation, owned by a privileged class and worked by a population of paupers?

It is impossible to suppose that those managing the affairs of the government, should not see what is to be the result of their action. It is my conviction, that they are deliberately laboring to produce such

a condition as I have described. If this be so, then the money holders who are allied to them, do not desire a restoration of prosperity for the masses. If an epidemic were prevailing among the horses, the buzzards would not strive to arrest it. As they, from the tree tops, beheld horses die, they would joyfully exclaim, as one of the leading money organs does when there is a large financial failure: "Another weak constitution has been weeded out;" there is another carcass to be preyed on. Of course cunning men can find a way *not* to relieve the country.

But, gentlemen, there are other causes for our present distressed condition, inferior only to the gigantic one I have been discussing. Since the war there has been taken from the people by taxation on an average fully \$400,000,000 per annum, for the purposes of the Federal government. To give persons who have not made calculations an idea of what this immense sum constitutes, let us make use of this explanation. Forty thousand dollars of silver weighs one ton, or a fair four horse load on our roads. One million, therefore, will load twenty-five of such wagons, and four hundred millions would make ten thousand such wagon loads. As wagons are usually driven along a road following each other, they would extend one hundred miles in length. An hundred miles of silver gives us an idea of how much of the people's money collected by taxation, the government is annually spending. Or to take another illustration. Suppose we have two hundred thousand voters in the State, which is rather more than we have yet voted. If a laborer should, after paying for his board and clothing, save fifty cents per day, he would, in three hundred working days, save one hundred and fifty dollars. It is not probable that the laborers of the State, on an average, realize as clear money, above one hundred and fifty dollars per year, to say nothing of the cost of their families. The work of the two hundred thousand, for a day, is worth \$100,000. Counting three hundred working days for the year, it would require that they should work at this rate, for more than thirteen years, to pay one year's expenses of the government of the United States. Think of this, gentlemen. It takes thirteen years labor of all our voters, at the usual rate of wages, to pay what the government spends in a single year. It is no wonder, therefore, that able men calculate that the debts of the government, and all the States, counties, and towns are equal, if reduced to a gold basis, to all the property in the country. Certainly, as a people, we shall grow poorer and poorer, unless we arrest these movements.

But, again, President Grant, in his message to Congress in December, 1871, calls the attention of that body in emphatic terms to the report of his civil service commissioners, in which they state that from the best information they could obtain, one-fourth of the money levied on the people did not reach the treasury. As in the previous year, upwards of \$400,000,000 was paid in, \$133,000,000 must have been embezzled by Grant's subordinate officers. In confirmation of this estimate, in the course of the debate in the Senate during the last session, in which Senators on both sides took part, it was considered that the loss in taxes to the government, on spirits alone, by delin-

quent officers, since the war, amounted to thirteen hundred million of dollars. This immense sum is exclusive of losses on tobacco and tariff taxes. During Tyler's administration, who was in office when you first elected me to Congress, the whole expenses of his term of four years amounted to only about \$85,000,000. It thus appears that according to the calculations of Grant and his civil service commissioners, the stealage of the officers under him in a single year, was sufficient for six years' expenditure under such an administration as that of Tyler. This sum of one hundred and thirty millions will be sufficient to require a line of wagons thirty miles long, and also demands more than four years of additional labor of all our voters to cover its cost.

Even these immense figures do not give us an adequate idea of the exactions on the people through the action of the government.

It is estimated by many well informed persons that of the tariff taxes paid by the people, on many articles, at least four-fifths does not go into the treasury, but is paid to the manufacturers as a bounty. Thus when a thousand dollars' worth of iron is bought for some of our railroads, in addition to this, at the rate of fifty per cent. duty, (the tariff taxes are generally higher than this) five hundred dollars has to be paid. If four-fifths of this iron be made in this country, then the manufacturers get four hundred dollars and the treasury only receive one hundred dollars. Hence, when the government collects two hundred millions, in gold, a much larger sum goes to the manufacturers, chiefly in the Northeastern States, so that the West and the South are the principal sufferers from this cause. It would not be difficult to so arrange a tariff, that while the people paid less, the government might receive a much larger sum than it does, and then if it were economically administered, the vexatious internal revenue taxes might be abolished entirely.

Unparalleled official corruption and peculation is also brought to your attention. The investigation of the Democratic House of Representatives have fully confirmed what President Grant said of the embezzlement of his subordinates. Belknap, his Secretary of War, and one of his most trusted friends, by indubitable proof, and his own confession of guilt, has been convicted of selling the offices in his department for large sums of money for his own private use. Even the President's brother, Orville Grant, had a number of offices turned over to him in order that, by selling them out, he might make money for himself. Certain friends of Robeson, Secretary of the Navy, have been selling the contracts at his disposal to persons who paid them as much as fifty thousand dollars at a time. Would he permit such a system to be carried on, unless he were equally guilty with Belknap? In the Interior department, the Indian and Land offices are regarded as the most corrupt branches of the administration.

In the Treasury Department, because Secretary Bristow prosecuted and convicted some of the whiskey thieves, he was obliged to get out of the office. A man who interferes vigorously with the operations of the thieves under him seems to be regarded as a wrong-doer. In like manner, Jewell, the Postmaster General, because he tried to put a

stop to the frauds by which his Department was robbed of large sums of money, was driven out of office. A stranger who looked upon the operations of our government for the first time, might suppose it was simply a system of machinery devised to extract money from the people and bestow it on knaves. The Minister at the Court of Great Britain, Schenck, was disgracefully driven by public opinion from his position, because he sold the influence of that position, for a valuable consideration, to a mining company, by which it was enabled to defraud innocent purchasers. The representative of the United States at the great Vienna exhibition, by his corrupt practices, covered himself with infamy and disgraced his country in the eyes of the nations of the earth. As Napoleon said, "Scratch the skin of a Russian and you will find a Tartar under it!" So it seems that when you probe this administration, you find it corrupt in all its branches.

When we call upon the people to remove from office the party which it represents, its friends attempt to defend it, not on any merit of its own, but by holding out the "bloody shirt," and by the use of money. They say, "corrupt as we are, you had better let us hold the government, than to allow a Democratic President to come in, because he might appoint some of the 'rebels' to office." If it were not for such appeals as this, the people of the North would *en masse* join us in turning them out. The Republican organs and orators, direct against us a constant torrent of denunciation and calumny. Such is the effect of their falsehood, that though, as you all know, thousands of men from the North are passing through our State, and stopping among us without molestation, yet I am often asked this question in Northern cities, "When will it be safe for a Northern man to go down in your State? I would like to go into North Carolina, if it were safe for me to do so." They declare that we intimidate and assault the negroes, to prevent their voting the Republican ticket. The only disturbance on an election day that I ever heard of, on account of politics, was the attack of a crowd of negroes on the mulatto man, Silas, at Asheville, some years ago, because he voted the Democratic ticket. It is true, that some negroes, whom I have known for the last twenty years, have told me that they would vote for the Democrats, if they were not afraid of their "*leagues*," but I have never yet heard of a single effort having been made to intimidate a negro, to prevent his voting for the Republicans.

Nevertheless, such is the prejudice excited against our section at the North, that its effects fall heavily on the Southern Republicans. A few years since, in the hall of the House of Representatives, I accidentally approached four North Carolina Republican Representatives, three of whom were natives, and the other termed a "carpet-bagger." I do not choose to call their names, though one of them sits before me, and another was then our own immediate representative. They said, "General, we have just been speaking of the manner in which our own political associates from the North treat us. They do not show us a particle of respect. Those Democratic members, on the other side of the House, show us more consideration than our own political friends do." Similar complaints are made to me by other Southern

Republicans. But they ought not to be surprised, for such treatment is but natural. If a man strives to elect himself to an office by abusing me, and I were to vote for him, nevertheless, he would feel a contempt for me. A dog may lick the foot that kicked him, but no man with self-respect or courage can. Though North Carolina has twice voted for Grant, yet the share of the offices at Washington, which the Republicans of this State have gotten, is so beggarly as to remind us of a hit made at a certain politician in the centre of this State, of whom it was said that he "washed the dirty clothes of his party, and took his pay in the soap-suds left." This satire represents the fate of Southern Republicans. I ask you, gentlemen, as well as politicians, how can you continue to act with a party whose main chance to sustain itself consists in its denunciation of your section? If it were not for the prejudice thus engendered against you in the minds of the Northern people, they would drive the Republicans from power with one universal shout of indignation.

Their second reliance is in the use of money. I was, gentlemen, as most of you know, elected from this Congressional District for fourteen years, and subsequently twice elected to the Senate of the United States. During no one of my canvasses was there, as far as I know, a single dollar expended to aid me, and my own expenditures, including hotel bills, the cost of printing my tickets, and all other expenses, I feel confident, were not two hundred and fifty dollars. In the present year, one of our Democratic candidates in the East assured me, that he was well satisfied that eleven thousand dollars had already been sent to his district to be used against him, and I was told at Washington, that our opponents would use at least one hundred thousand dollars to carry this State.

Gentlemen, before the war an able-bodied negro slave readily commanded \$1,500, and it used to be said that "a white man was as good as a negro if he behaved himself." If any of you sell yourselves, you ought at least to get fifteen hundred dollars in cash down. I understand, however, it is not expected that the money should be paid directly to the voters, but that it is to be given to certain individuals, who claim to be able each to control a certain number of voters. How do you like this idea? Esau sold his birthright for mess of pottage, but then Esau intended to eat the pottage himself. You are asked to sell your birthright for pottage for the revenueurs and their associates to eat. General Leach told me that when he was last a candidate, the agents in his district to whom the Republican managers gave their money, stole it themselves, so that it never reached the voters for whom it was intended. In this view of the case, I would advise those who are in market, to "look sharp" lest they may be defrauded.

It was ever my pleasure, gentlemen, to owe my success to the unbought suffrages of a free people. I trust that it may be well understood that my political friends are to make no expenditure, except for the printing and circulation of such documents as may be necessary to give information to the people.

We could not hope to compete with our adversaries in a money contest. They have arrayed, on their side, not only the great bondhold-

ing, and other money interests, but they have a countless horde of office-holders. Since Grant was inaugurated, in time of profound peace, the number of officers has been increased from upwards of 54,000 to 90,000. You see how they swarm around you like flies about a horse, on a warm evening. Judge Dick, of the Federal Court, said on the bench not long since, that this district had more than ten times its share in proportion to the rest of the United States. You, gentlemen, know, and see, that their principle business is to electioneer for their party, because there being few negroes here, unless they can by such means prevent it, they know that the vote of the white men will settle the State against them.

All these officers are taxed in every election for party purposes. One of their most prominent and respectable officers, at Asheville, told me a few days since, in the presence of several gentlemen, that he had been compelled last year, in the Convention election of our State, to pay three hundred dollars for the use of his party. Another prominent member of the party, who has filled high positions in it, told me this week, that in the Eastern part of the State they were taxed five per cent. of their salaries. At Washington, as I see from the papers lately, they call up the officers, even the women clerks, on pay day, and make them pay two per cent. of their salaries to raise an electioneering fund.

Gentlemen, these things are so astonishing, that I do not wonder that you seem surprised. How different it was in the old Democratic and Whig times. Mr. Jefferson, after his election, told his officers that they ought not to interfere with popular elections. When General Harrison was inaugurated, his Secretary of State, Mr. Webster, issued, by his order, a proclamation forbidding the executive office-holders to attempt to influence the elections. If, during my entire term in Congress, any President had permitted his officers to be thus taxed, and that fact had been made public, I should have felt it my duty to move articles of impeachment against him. I have no doubt that such a motion would have been sustained by an unanimous vote. Under the party, at present in power, the officers are not only to be as active as they may choose to be, but they are required to work, and in addition to this, are compelled to pay part of their salaries to support the party. The people are heavily taxed for useless officers, and in turn these officers are taxed to keep the people in bondage, or subject to them. In our Declaration of Independence against Great Britain, one of the principal grievances set forth is the charge that the King of Great Britain had "sent into the country a swarm of officers to eat out the substance of the people." What would the patriots of that day have thought of such a swarm as we now have in the United States, constituting, as they do, an immense band of hired mercenaries. Julius Cæsar said, "give me money, and with it I can hire men, and with these men I will be able to get more money and men; and in time I will become the master of the world." Messrs. Clay, Webster and Calhoun, forty years ago, made their ablest speeches against the dangers to be apprehended from an alliance between the money power and the government with its official patronage. In such a contingency they

doubted if the people would be able to retain their liberties. We now have a body of officers immensely exceeding in number what they dreamed of as probable, in close alliance with a system of national banks, having an aggregate capital tenfold greater than that of the old United States bank, aided by the influence of an additional money-power, represented by the holders of two thousand million dollars of government debt.

It is this immense force that secures orators and newspapers to mislead the people, and blind them as to their true interests, and keep them divided by immaterial issues.

While they, by misrepresentation and calumny, strive thus to array the Northern people against us as a section, they, on the other hand, have been rallying the colored voters against us, first, by promising them land and mules, and when that deception could no longer be used, and other falsehoods had been found unavailing, they have sought to hold them embodied against us by the civil rights act. That act was urged by some of the prominent negroes and mulattoes about Washington, who were anxious to secure higher social position and white wives. They threaten to carry the body of negro voters against the Republicans unless such measures are passed. The pretence that this act was passed from feelings of sympathy for the colored race is transparent hypocrisy, for there have always been free negroes in the North, who were treated as inferiors, and yet even the Abolitionists never procured the passage in any State of such a law as this. If there were negroes enough among them to be troublesome, they would not tolerate such a law for a single day. Only last week the papers stated that at Newport, Rhode Island, one of the most decided Republican States, a Southern negro married a white woman, and a crowd of men and women followed them home, and stoned the house in which they took refuge. They impose these things on us, partly to secure the support of the negroes, and also to gratify the malignity of our violent enemies, who would like to see us degraded to the condition of some of the mongrel and mulatto countries south of us, so that we might be easily kept in subjection.

The policy of the Republican party thus appears to be to oppress us with heavy taxation and negro equality. The Democratic party are for low taxes and separation of the two races. In accordance with these principles, here in our own State, our late Convention, by the amendments proposed for your adoption, seeks to greatly reduce your taxation and expenses, and to resist negro equality by providing separate schools, forbidding marriage between the races, and the binding out of white orphan girls and boys to negro masters. Others will explain these points fully to you. In their efforts to retain power, our opponents show themselves ready to array the North against the South, the negro against the white man, and one christian denomination against another.

Our adversaries are cunning in their strategy. For example, they tell us that the times are hard in England and other European countries. But the United States was the principal customer of Great Britain, and, therefore, when we ceased to be able to buy their pro-

ductions, they, after a time, began to suffer from the loss of trade. The suffering here was produced by the direct action of our government. If the government of Great Britain, were by its conduct, to produce one-tenth part of the injury, that we have suffered, a change of the ministry would be the result. A like state of suffering, from similar causes in France, would produce a revolution there in three days. It remains to be seen, whether or not, the American people will sit quiet and mute, and allow themselves to be strangled, like the Turks submit to the plague as the decree of fate, and the Hindoos rested while being robbed to starvation, by the agents of the East India Company. If they are not prepared to be thus destroyed, then they must gird up their loins and stand like men.

Again, the Republican organs tell us that if we can just get rid of all paper money, a great stream of gold will flow into the country in exchange for our products sent abroad. They know well that for ten years past our imports from foreign countries exceed in value, what we export to them, and that every year we are sending abroad gold and silver taken from our mines to reduce the balance against us. When, for example, a bale of cotton is sent to France, instead of its value in gold, a silk dress or some other commodity comes back in its place. They know full well, that if we had all the gold even in the world it would scarcely be sufficient to pay off all the public debts of the United States, the separate States, and corporations. They know, too, equally well, that in the struggle of all the nations of the earth for this gold, the share we could obtain, would be ten times less than what we need to carry on the business of the country.

The wealthy men ought to see that by oppressing the laboring classes they will, in the end, injure themselves. Their conduct reverses the fable of Menenius Agrippa. Instead of the members conspiring against the belly, in their case it is the belly that makes war upon the members to which it must look to be fed. If they destroy the business of the country, they cannot realize profits from their capital. Besides, all men of intelligence should see that a continuance of the present condition of affairs must destroy our free system. All the great empires of antiquity perished from internal corruption. In modern times we have similar examples. Santa Anna said he could not keep up armies in Mexico, because his subordinate officers embezzled all the money he gave them to maintain his soldiers in the field. During the Crimean war the Emperor of Russia made a similar complaint. The recent downfall of the Emperor Napoleon was largely due to the fact, that his officers appropriated the public money given them to hire soldiers, and furnished instead on paper, fictitious lists of names, without men in the ranks to represent them. The present condition of our navy, notwithstanding the large appropriations made for it, reminds us of these things.

Perhaps, fellow-citizens, the most remarkable feature of the present canvass is a circular of the Attorney-General of the United States. As it is published generally, I need not read it at length. It declares in plain language that each Marshal of the United States has the right, at his own will, to appoint as many deputies as he chooses, and that

each and every one of these Deputy Marshals has the right to arrest any one that he believes has hindered any person from registration, or voting, or injured him for so doing, or any person whom he believes has conspired for any such purpose. Secondly, that he has the right to summon to aid him in making or carrying out such arrests, any person above the age of fifteen years, no matter what may be the occupation or station of such persons, whether civil or military; and that he may also summons to his assistance any sheriff and his *posse comitatus*. He further states that these Deputy Marshals shall disregard any State official, or any State law, or process whatever from any official. In effect, the Marshal of this District may, if he chooses appoint thousands of Deputies, and any one of these Deputies may arrest at his will the most respectable man now present, and should the Judge now holding this court issue his writ of *habeas corpus*, in order that he may enquire why this arrest has been made, the Marshal shall disregard such a writ, and may even summon the Judge to guard his prisoner. Under these instructions of the Attorney-General, one of these Deputies might have arrested the Judge who has to-day been holding court, and if the Sheriff had then been with his *posse* in the act of carrying a prisoner to jail, this Deputy Marshal, such as some you have among you, might have summoned the Sheriff with his *posse* instantly to come and guard the Judge. In such a case neither the Supreme Court of our State, nor any officer in it, has the right to interfere to protect the liberty of our citizens. If such a condition of things as this be not irresponsible tyranny, I know not what can constitute it. No king of Great Britain ever pretended to have such power. Our ancestors rebelled against one king for much less cause than this; and now it seems we are to have a countless number of petty tyrants, each of whom is absolute in his sway. It remains to be seen, if the people of the Northern States will tolerate the loss of their own liberty merely to enable the Republican party to maintain itself in power. You have, fellow-citizens, already felt the evils resulting from the privileges given to this class of officers. In more than one instance, in this region, have citizens been shot down by them, in some cases without a color of legal excuse, and after indictment in our State court, the case has been referred to the Federal court. There, before a friendly Judge, defended by the United States District Attorney, tried by a jury, composed of the friends of the officers and ignorant negroes, who are induced to believe that if they do not sustain the officers they will themselves be again reduced to slavery, the acquittal is easy and certain. I know, gentlemen, well the difficulties which surround us. Though two-thirds probably of all the property in the State was destroyed by the war, yet our people went resolutely to work to repair their losses, and seemed to be making much progress. Since the reconstruction acts, our credit has been destroyed, and we are overwhelmed with debt. Notwithstanding these things, the people have been quiet generally, and probably no State has, for some years past, been freer from crime, and every citizen votes and speaks as he chooses, without threat or molestation. And yet, in spite of all this, in a late issue of the *National Republican*, the gov-

ernment organ at Washington, it is stated that unless we change our course and please them better, the lines of the States in the South must be disregarded, the territory must be cut up into districts, and governed by military commanders. In the case of violent collisions, which have sometimes occurred in portions of the South between the races, many of them, like that at Asheville, which I witnessed, as it was clearly shown then, were instigated by white Republicans expressly for political effect. But for such interferences, the two races would move on harmoniously together in the enjoyment of their legal and political rights.

What, fellow-citizens, is the attitude of the two parties, with respect to these issues? That of the Republican is well known. Though after the war ended, the principal of the debt of the government was payable in greenbacks according to such authorities as Thad. Stevens and B. F. Butler, yet the party in 1869, against the vote of every Democrat, made it payable in coin. This act doubled the value of the bonds, increased the debt in that ratio, and added proportionately to the burden of the people. Not content with this, they demonetized silver, as already stated, and then, still further to add to the distress of the country, they passed the resumption act to destroy the paper circulation. The party is now being pressed forward by its leaders in this course. Mr. Hayes, their Presidential candidate, declares that he is in favor of resuming specie payment at the time indicated, unless a still more speedy measure can be invented. He is for strangling the country then, unless some one will show him how to do it sooner. Under him, too, the old officials, with their corrupt practices, are to be retained in their places.

The position of the Democratic party is the reverse of this. In the present Congress, in spite of the opposition of the Republicans, they obtained a vote of nearly two-thirds in favor of restoring silver to its position as money. Our platform, as adopted at St. Louis, declares for a repeal of the Resumption Act. We are, in the first place, for taking the rope from the man's neck who is about to be strangled, and then if he does not recover of himself, we will give suitable remedies. In other words, after the country is relieved from its pressure, if prosperity does not return, other measures will be adopted. The present national bank system may be essentially modified. Probably the greenbacks may be made receivable for all the government dues, so that like the Treasury notes that were issued in former times, they may become of equal value with gold. Though France, after being conquered by Prussia, and obliged to pay an enormous fine, had afloat \$602,000,000 of inconvertible notes like our greenbacks, but nearly twice as much as we have, by simply agreeing that they should be received for all debts to government, she made them of equal value with gold. Why should not the same be done here? If we put in able and patriotic men, who are willing to relieve the country, they will find a way to do it.

The Democracy have a majority in the present House of Representatives, and in spite of the opposition of the Republican Senate, they succeeded in reducing the expenses of the government nearly \$30,000,000 below last year's expenses. But there was some reduction last year

below the previous rate, and Republicans claim credit for this; but in fact why was it done by them? The election in 1874 showed great Democratic gains; the people were rising in their might and demanding reform. Seeing that there would be a large majority of Democrats in the next House to overhaul their doings, the Republicans went to work to set their house in order that they might die with decency. "Coming events cast their shadows before them," and the shadows of the national Democracy, as they marched forward, fell over them, and filled them with alarm. And when the Democrats actually came in, though compelled to fight both the Senate and the President, they effected these great results. Let us this year give them all the departments and we may hope for complete relief.

In Gov. Samuel J. Tilden we have the right man for this work. About six years ago he discovered that there had been fraudulent embezzlements of the public funds in New York. He took the matter in hand and prosecuted the guilty so vigorously that he broke up the ring, scattered its members, and got some of the more guilty into the penitentiary. His work was done so thoroughly and successfully, that the people of his State insisted on running him for the office of Governor. His opponent, Gov. Dix, was the strongest man the Republicans had in their ranks, and had been elected to the office by 50,000 majority. Tilden beat him by 51,000 votes, making the enormous gain of more than 100,000 votes. When he became Governor he did not rest on what he had done. There was in the State an immense combination of bad men of both parties, known as the "canal ring." With great labor he succeeded in breaking it up, and convicting many of its leaders. This ring had for years existed, and though composed mainly of Republicans, it had drawn into it, for the sake of their influence, some dishonest Democrats. Its power may be judged from this circumstance. Formerly the State of New York derived a large revenue from the tolls on its great canals, but this was all stopped by this ring, and they actually had the influence to obtain in taxes, from the people, to keep the canals in order, \$2,400,000. Governor Tilden stopped this great stealing operation, and relieved the State from this immense tax on the people, and now the canals are in better condition without this subsidy than they were with it in the hands of the thieves.

He has also reduced the expenses of the State government from sixteen millions a year to little above eight millions. So overwhelming is his popularity that the people of his State presented him at St. Louis for our Presidential candidate, and pressed his claims with the most unbounded enthusiasm.

Gentlemen, is he not just such a man as we need to take charge both of our State and national governments? When Tilden is inaugurated at Washington, as I believe he will be on the 4th of March next, he will find such an immense operation before him that I think he will have to try the plan of Hercules. As you doubtless remember, Hercules was a bound boy, and like other boys in that condition, he was compelled to do a great amount of hard work. He was so strong, and worked so rapidly that he was obliged to travel from place to place to obtain em-

ployment. During his ramblings he came into the dominions of a certain King Augeus. This king was a great stock raiser, and he had kept 30,000 yoke of oxen for thirty years in one stable without ever having it cleaned out. Hercules undertook the job, but on looking into it, he saw it was useless to try it with the spade. There was a considerable river not far off, on high ground. Hercules tore open the side of the mountain, and let the water down into the stables, and everything was thus swept out.

Providence, who foresees all things, and in His goodness provides for all things, has created on this continent such rivers as Hercules never saw when he marched through Greece. On the North there is the great St. Lawrence, with its immense column of blue water at Niagara; then west of the Alleghanies is the beautiful Ohio and the majestic Mississippi, the father of rivers, and the mighty Missouri, rising in the Rocky Mountains 10,000 feet above the sea, and coming down with the falling force of its two miles descent. Tilden will combine all these rivers into one mighty mass of falling water, and direct its immense volume against the city of Washington, and as it sweeps through the White House and the various Departments of the government, there will be a froth, a foam and a filth never hitherto seen. In its onward course, carrying such a load with it, it will sweep across the Chesapeake Bay and out into the broad Atlantic. But when it strikes against the Gulf Stream, that great ocean river, seventy miles wide, and running with the speed of the Mississippi itself, it will, I think, be deflected northward. The first land it will strike against will be the State of Maine. It will carry along with it, some things not a stranger to that State. The "carpet-baggers" will all get a free ride home. With our approbation this time, they will go go back as dead-heads. Upon reflection I think that great advantage will result to the State of Maine from this operation, for some years ago I read in the Patent Office Report that the land in the State of Maine was so poor that a man could not support himself by agriculture. This material, if we may judge of its qualities from the odors it sends out, is the strongest manure in the world, far surpassing Peruvian guano, or any other known substance. After fertilizing that State, it will be swept on northward, and the rocky coast of Labrador will bloom like a flower garden, and Greenland will become green again, and the Esquimaux Indians in their snow huts, will smell a sweet savor as it passes by. The greater portion of it will be carried to the North Pole, and there locked in everlasting ice, unless it shall occur that when "Satan is loosed for a season" to plague the nations, he should chance to poke up his horn in that quarter, and by liberating it add to the affliction of humanity.

Wherever we look, gentlemen, there seems to be a growing desire for a change in the action of the government. When a great party is thrown out of office, it is sometimes said that it has lost the floating vote. Many suppose that the vote thus referred to, is that of persons without stability of purpose. But that class consists of individuals, who are secured on the day of the election by the agents of either party. This is not the vote, that usually is the instrument that throws out one party and puts in another. There are in the country men of intelligence, principle, and great firmness of purpose, who scorn to be mere party "backs." Their patriotism and integrity enable them to rise above mere party consider-

tions, and look to the great interest of their country. While true to principle, they may seem to be changeable as respects party. Suppose that a shallow and superficial man should for the first time, enter a court room during a trial. After listening to the counsel of the plaintiff and then of the defendant, he will hear the charge of the Judge, which settles the case in favor of the plaintiff; when the next case comes up, he would be ready to say, he knew how the case would go, because the Judge appeared to be a firm man, and to be consistent he must be in favor of the plaintiff again. What, then, would be his astonishment to see that the Judge in that case had gone over to the side of the defendant? After witnessing a week's proceedings he might exclaim, "Was there ever such a floater as this Judge?" He might not be able to see, that the Judge was all the while, pursuing the direct line of truth.

If, when you happen to be on the jury, a man should say to you, "Sir, last court you decided a case in my favor, and as you are a firm and consistent man, I know you'll decide in my favor at this term," you might reply, "It is true that I did find in your favor in that land suit, but the issue is now quite a different one in the horse stealing case, with which you are now charged." And yet, gentlemen, it is precisely by such argument as this, that the present Republican leaders seek to induce you to stand by that party. They say you voted with us formerly, and that you must do it again, or be inconsistent. You may reply to them that you formerly voted with them for reconstruction perhaps, but that there is a very different issue now to be decided, and that is whether the country is to be ruined by their oppression and robberies.

As patriots and true friends of your country, it is now your duty to remove from office, those who abuse the trust you have given them.

Instead of making any fair or manful defence, they seek to divert your minds from the true issue and excite your prejudices by referring to past events, that in fact, have no connection with the present. The man who, when you are moving forward, tries to make you look backward all the while, wishes you to fall in the pit he has dug for you. If it were not for feelings and prejudice growing out of events long since passed by, the people would with one voice demand a change. Of course I except the officeholders who wish to get a living at your expense.

When travelling on a steamboat along a river, I have observed that occasionally, a heavy weight on rollers is moved from one side of the boat to the other. The movement of this mass changes the direction of the vessel, so that it does not run on a quicksand, or against dangerous rocks and, in fact, it regulates the steamer and directs it safely on its course. In like manner, when the men of intelligence and public spirit change their position, they carry weight with them, and regulate properly the action of the government, and the country is saved from danger.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, discard all past prejudices, and by common consent move forward to reform the government. We can thus restore prosperity to the people, and show to all the world, that we are capable of maintaining in its purity, the free system, which we have inherited from glorious ancestors.

MODES OF PUBLIC SPEAKING.

With respect to speech making in general, it may not be out of place to say this much. Mr. Fox is reported to have remarked once, that if a speech read well, we might depend on it, that it was a bad speech when delivered, and if on the contrary, it were a good speech as delivered, then it would read badly. This remark is not, however, universally true, for there are many exceptions to its accuracy. Nevertheless, it must be admitted, that in a majority of cases, to a certain extent, it may be accepted. Or it may be said, with more propriety perhaps, that the style of speaking directly to an audience, is so different from the usual style of the mere essayist, that the distinction between them is very striking.

Frequently in speaking, something is gained for the moment, by a little dwelling on a thought, which requires the use of a word or two, that in print, appear unnecessary. But on the other hand, it more frequently occurs that fewer words are needed by the speaker, his gesture, look, and tone, assisting to make a strong impression. During the first years of my service in Congress, there was no verbal reporting, but only a synopsis of a speech, taken down by a ready-writer. The speaker then might have the use of these notes, to assist him in writing out his speech, for publication. One or two weeks thus elapsed before the speech appeared in print. It may be remembered, that on one occasion, when Mr. Clay complained that General Jackson had not sent in a veto message to a bill, which had passed about the last day of the session, Mr. Benton said, that this demand was unreasonable, because it required senators, with the aid of reporters, two or three weeks to prepare their own speeches for the press. As to Mr. Benton's method, he instead of denying his dependance on preparation, as many vain and insincere men do, rather plumed himself on his labor. Mr. Mangum, who always remained on good terms with him, told me that Mr. Benton said, that his practice was to write his speech out fully, and then re-write and condense it as much as possible, and after its delivery, give it to the reporters with the understanding that they might add, if necessary to it, before it went to press.

I always found that I could get along while speaking with fewer words usually, than when I attempted to express the same thoughts in writing. One of my earlier speeches was published in the *Intelligencer* more than a week after its delivery. On the day of its appearance, Mr. Barnard, a member from New York, said to me, "I wish you to explain this to me. When I saw your speech this morning, it occupied so much space in the paper, that I supposed you had added greatly to it, but on reading it over, I could find nothing that you had not, while speaking, distinctly stated." In my practice I have frequently found that I could easily throw into the words of a single sentence, thoughts that if written out, would require two or three sentences to present them clearly, and in a proper order.

On my complaining one day to Mr. Gales of the delay then required in getting speeches out, on account of the imperfect system of reporting at that time, he said, "If you will write out the report of your speech, and on its delivery, hand it to me, I will insert it at once." In some instances I tried the experiment, with advantage as far as the publication was concerned. But on the other hand, it was rather prejudicial to the delivery, not only because the freshness and animation of the first utterance of the thoughts was somewhat diminished, but also because it was a disadvantage, if any of the particular words written should be remembered while I was speaking. Hence, if at any

time I tried this mode, with a view of getting a neat and accurate report, I avoided re-reading what was verbally prepared, and endeavored to let it pass out of the mind, so that I might, as much as possible, speak from the impulse of the time, untrammelled by memory. On the contrary, if one is merely rehearsing what he has verbally prepared, it is difficult for him to speak with the animation and force of a natural speaker.

Persons wishing to compare the two modes in the same speaker, may see the difference exemplified in this volume. The speech on the tariff, delivered on the 21st of August, 1852, in the House, appears as reported by the stenographers, while that in the Senate of February 10, 1859, on the same subject, has the marks of written construction in its sentences. Again, the speech of February 5, 1857, had verbal preparation, while that on the same subject, delivered May 5, 1858, went the same evening to the press, as reported by the stenographers.

The speech of January 16, 1860, was carefully prepared for publication, while that of May 7th and 8th, 1860, appears, as taken down by the reporters. These examples are sufficient to illustrate the differences between speeches as written, and as spoken.

MODE OF ELECTING A PRESIDENT.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, Feb. 22, 1877.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled :

GENTLEMEN : As a citizen and one of your constituents, I avail myself of the privilege of addressing you directly, on a subject of great public interest. You have recently, in your places as Senators and Representatives, been much and earnestly occupied with the consideration of the best mode of amending the Constitution, so as to improve the administration of the Government.

Even if you do not concur in the opinions I may express, yet the suggestions made may not be without value, as while combatting error, we often arrive at the truth.

The evils resulting from the present mode of choosing a President of the United States are too well known to you to render it necessary, that they should be recapitulated. With a view of averting them, it has been proposed to extend the term of the President to six years.

It is respectfully submitted that this would merely aggravate the mischief of the present mode. It is the magnitude of the interests involved that causes the danger, rather than the frequency of the elections. After a contest has been decided, we often hear those disappointed say that four years will soon roll round, and then they hope for a better result. If a President were elected for life, in a close contest there would prob-

ably be civil war, such as resulted in Poland when a king was chosen. By extending the length of the term, the excitement growing out of the struggle is increased, and all the mischiefs are aggravated.

It has struck me that the true remedy will be found, in providing that the President shall be annually elected, as the Roman Consuls were. But it may be suggested that the country might thus be kept in a state of perpetual excitement.

To prevent this, the electoral college ought to be rendered a permanent body, after such a fashion as this: In each of the States let there be provided, of contiguous territory, as many electoral districts as the States are severally entitled to choose electors, and then provide that each of these districts shall elect one elector, who shall hold office for life. In addition to such qualifications as are necessary to constitute a Senator, let it be required, that each elector shall be of not less than fifty years of age, and that his acceptance of the office shall disqualify him from holding any other office, or place of trust, Federal or State, during his term as elector, and for two years after his resignation, if he should choose to shorten his life tenure by resigning. Should an elector die or resign, then the Governor of the State might be authorized to order an election to fill the vacancy.

These electors should be required to meet in the early part of December in each year, at the Capitol, and then in open session, by a *viva voce* vote, elect a President and Vice President. Should they fail to elect within one week by a majority vote, then let it be provided that the person who during their voting, first obtained a plurality, should be the President. The knowledge of this regulation would insure that during the week, they would select some person by a majority vote.

If the election were conducted in this mode, there would be little room for fraud or mistake. When, however, the two houses of Congress might meet to ascertain the vote, and pronounce the result, as they should be required to do in January, if they were to disagree on any point, that disagreement might be referred to the Supreme Court, to be decided in February. If this plan were adopted, it is not likely that there would be a contested election in a thousand years. At the end of one week's session the college of electors should be dissolved, and the members, after receiving such compensation in the form of mileage, as the law might provide, would return to private life until the next year.

The President thus elected should hold the office for one year, and be forever afterward ineligible. His powers and duties might remain as they now are, except that while he should retain the right to appoint his Cabinet, he ought to be allowed only to appoint officers to fill such vacancies as might occur, during his term of office. The terms of all the executive officers should be fixed by law for periods, say, of four, six or eight years, or longer, as might be deemed advisable by Congress. Each President should have the right to fill all such vacancies as might occur, while he was in office, and Congress, in the first instance, should so provide that only a portion of the officers might go out in each year. In addition to this, the President should be authorized to remove for cause assigned by him, unless the Senate should dissent from the act. The heads of departments might, in like manner, be authorized to remove their subordinates for cause, with a right of appeal on the part of these

subordinates to such a reviewing board, as might be provided by law. These provisions would be necessary to prevent causeless removals.

The plan as a whole will be better understood, if we consider some of the objections likely to be urged against it.

In the first place it may be said that this scheme, if carried into operation, would deprive the people of the right to elect a President.

This objection will, on a moment's reflection, be found rather one in seeming, than in reality. As things are now managed, the people are compelled to decide merely with reference to the merits of two or three individuals, whose names are presented by so-called national conventions.

For the last thirty years, with the single exception of those held during the war in 1864, I have attended one of those conventions that have been called together every fourth year, and, therefore, I have acquired some knowledge in relation to the management of such bodies. The result of their operations has usually depended upon the movements of less than half a dozen skillful individuals, rather than the wishes of a majority of the parties they have professed to represent.

To illustrate this position, I will present a single case. In the Democratic convention which assembled at Baltimore, in the year 1844, there was a protracted struggle between the friends, and opponents of Mr. Van Buren. Owing to an equal division of the districts represented, the vote of North Carolina was for a time, not cast. Louis D. Henry, with half the delegates, was for the renomination of Mr. Van Buren, while Romulus M. Saunders headed the opposition to him. While the struggle was in progress, Saunders received a letter informing him, that at a meeting in Cleveland county, at which only about half a dozen persons were present, he had been authorized, as their proxy, to cast their vote. Cleveland was a small county in the ninth congressional district, which I then was representing in Congress. As no other county had taken any action, Judge Saunders claimed the right to represent the district and cast its vote. This claim was allowed, the vote of North Carolina was, as a whole, cast for Mr. Polk, and his nomination was thus secured. It is nevertheless true that the persons in Cleveland who had authorized Judge Saunders to cast their vote, were themselves strongly in favor of the renomination of Mr. Van Buren. Judge Saunders, however, having a dislike to Mr. Van Buren for personal reasons, chose to represent himself, rather than those who had constituted him their agent. But that little Cleveland meeting defeated Mr. Van Buren certainly, and probably Mr. Clay also.

Instead of delegates to conventions, appointed by meetings, in which a few persons only participate, the electors chosen in the manner I propose, would be elected after a full notice, as provided by law, and probably with such a canvass as would make each one generally known to his constituents. In that case he would be more likely to represent the views of the people, than do the present delegates. Under such a system Mr. Clay would have been more likely to be chosen than Mr. Polk, while Mr. Webster, perhaps, would have been taken rather than Franklin Pierce. It might be expected that such persons, as would then be the electors, would look over the Union for prominent statesmen.

A second objection to the plan I propose might, perhaps, be, that these electors would constitute an oligarchy. Were they to remain in session

for a long period, and be invested with any continuous powers, some apprehension might possibly be felt; but, in fact, at the end of a single week, they would, as a body, be dissolved, and would separate until called together in the succeeding year. They would have no more control over the President they had chosen, than the Roman cardinals have over the Pope they have once elected, or than the President now has over the judges of the Supreme Court, after they have once been placed on the bench for life.

It may be said, however, that if Presidents are elected annually, the policy of the Government will be fluctuating. For the last twenty-five years, Andrew Johnson was the only President who professed to have a policy, and he had probably less *direct* influence on the action of the Government, than any of his predecessors.

Even President Grant's St. Domingo scheme met, perhaps, with less favor, than if it had been brought forward by some influential Senator.

The policy of the British Government is well settled, and yet for a century it has not materially depended on the views of the reigning sovereign. In like manner the policy of the United States has not, to any very great extent, been influenced by the views of the Presidents. The discussions in the two houses of Congress, in the press, and by speakers and writers throughout the country, give shape to our policy. With our railroads and telegraphs, the opinion of the country can be ascertained, concentrated, and brought to bear on the Government, with almost as much facility as could the views of the Roman people be ascertained in their forum, or of the Athenians in their assemblies.

It is, however, sometimes said that party divisions are essential to insure a proper examination of questions of policy. This seems to me a mistake. Discussion is undoubtedly necessary to promote a wise decision, but this will be more instructive, in the absence of high party excitement. During General Washington's administration there were no well defined party lines, yet public questions were sufficiently discussed at that time. From the accession of Mr. Jefferson, in 1801, to that of Mr. Adams, in 1825, with the exception of the effort made by the Federalists during the war, against Mr. Madison, there was scarcely a well-marked party line of division. Yet measures were thoroughly discussed and examined. Mr. Clay's speech on the Seminole war, Mr. Webster's on Foote's resolution, and Mr. Calhoun's speeches on the currency, are far more instructive than Ogle's speech on Van Buren's gold spoons, which had so great a run in the Harrison contest. The ordinary campaign speech abounds frequently in such coarse images, and appeals to the lower passions, that few gentlemen would recommend them as models for the study of students.

There would be under this system, a far better opportunity afforded to the States, to obtain good government. The choice of the Governor in Oregon, for example, would not then depend upon the question, as to whether the friends of Tilden or Hayes could throw the largest amount of money, and send the greatest number of speakers, to influence the October elections of Indiana and Ohio. We chose a superintendent of public instruction in North Carolina, not from any examination of the merits of the candidates, but solely on the consideration as to whether Tilden or Hayes, was the most suitable person to be elected

President of the United States. Such a proceeding is scarcely less absurd than it would be to say, that the size of the boot a man was to wear should not be determined by the dimensions of his foot, but rather upon the question as to whether Boston or Fashion had made the quickest time in a four-mile race. If the States were kept out of the great current of Federal politics, they would make their selections of officers, as they ought to do, turn on questions of State interest and the fitness of the candidates.

The electors under this mode would usually be eminent persons, who have retired from politics, or other prominent citizens. As they would consist of more than three hundred in number, and be separated over a territory of many thousand miles, they would not be at all likely to be carried by sudden impulses. Still more difficult would it be to influence such a body by bribery or other undue means. In fact, no elector has hitherto, in a single instance, failed to discharge the duty required of him, precisely in the manner he was expected to do. They would almost inevitably choose men of eminence. As the President would hold only for a single year, and possess little patronage, there would be no adequate inducement for a number of partisans to co-operate, to influence the choice of the electors. We should be freed from the practice of taxing officeholders, nor would "the custom-house gang," as Mr. Greeley called them, abandon their public duties to go up to State conventions.

Again, as the presidential term would endure but a single year, Judges of the Supreme Court, and prominent army officers would not be willing to surrender their positions for so short a term in the Presidency. Nor would Senators, or distinguished members of the House, be willing to give up their terms for a single year's service in the Cabinet. In fact the presidential power and influence would not override the Government, as it now does, and disturb the movements of the co-ordinate branches. If the planet Jupiter were to so increase in bulk, as to distract the motions of Mars and Saturn on either side of him, the true remedy would be, to reduce the old heathen to his original dimensions, so that he could not longer do mischief to his neighbors. If this were accomplished the President would, as the Constitution intended him to be, again become merely the person to execute the laws and exercise such powers as have been devolved on him. He might then discharge the duties of his office, as quietly as the Supreme Court does the functions assigned to its department, or as the President of the Swiss Republic performs his duties.

No real objection can exist to allowing the inferior executive officers to hold their places for specified terms. In the States it is not found, that any mischief arises from permitting their treasurers, clerks, and other officers to hold for specified terms; and with the right in the President and heads of departments to remove for cause, the system would work just as well under the Federal Government.

If the electors were chosen from persons above fifty years of age, it is probable that, from natural cause, at least half of them would go out in ten years; and even if at the first election there should chance to be some party preponderance it would, by the coming in quietly of twenty or thirty new electors in each year, soon cease to exist. After the decen-

nial enumeration and a new apportionment, it might be provided that, in States having a surplus, vacancies arising by death should not be filled, except to keep up the proper number, or the excess in a State might be dropped by lot.

Under this system there would be no national party conventions, nor a struggle between the office-holders and office-seekers. The first class would not be taxed to help the party, nor would the second make voluntary contributions to assist in agitating the popular mind. But as the country was, for more than forty years, well governed without such institutions, they might well be dispensed with. Even as late as the 20th of March, 1841, Mr. Webster, then Secretary of State, by direction of President Harrison, issued a circular to the officers, informing them that "partizan efforts, or the payment of money by way of contribution, or assessment for party purposes, would be regarded as a cause for removal."

Can civil service reform be effected under the present system? Will not things probably become worse rather than better?

It has even sometimes been asserted that the President, to secure the co-operation of Senators, agrees to divide the exercise of the appointing power with them. If so, this seems to be a plain violation of the Constitution, for it is evident that this instrument intended that the President, and the Senate should decide independently of each other. It is clear that the Senate was expected to act, when necessary, as a check on the President, just as in treasuries and in banks, it is usual, for safety in disbursements of money, to provide that the concurrence of several persons shall be required. By such practices as this, and by his control over the officers of the Government as of late manifested, it is evident that a President may exercise such influence as to absorb powers that ought to belong to the other departments, and in fact disturb the equilibrium of the Constitution.

While considering this great subject, I ask you to recur to what was probably familiar to your minds in your college days—the discussions of Polybius on topics connected with the rise, progress, and decline of governments. His concise passages with respect to governments in general, his analysis of the Roman Government, then in its most perfect condition, and his comparison of that and the Carthaginian Government, present pregnant suggestions of a great thinker.

The Anglo-Saxon race has ever shown great vitality, and remarkable powers of recuperation. It was able to shake off the despotism of the Tudor monarchs, and exhibited still higher powers, in recovering from the corruptions of the period of Charles II. In like manner our countrymen, if properly aided by the prominent men, will strike off the evil influences, that seem to endanger the existence of our free institutions. Why should we not return to the economy, simplicity, and purity of the earlier administrations?

Several prominent gentlemen of both houses of Congress, to whom I have explained the above suggested plan, admitted that it would answer the purposes intended, and relieve us from the threatening dangers, but expressed doubt as to whether the people could be induced to sanction it. But what our countrymen generally desire is good government. In my own experience, I have invariably observed, that if sound views were fairly presented to the people, they were ready to accept them, rather

than the opposite ones. It is the mere demagogue, who distrusts the intelligence and honesty of the people, and who resorts to what he deems, cunning stratagems to secure their support. Should you present a fair and just plan, which carried on its face evidence, that it was calculated to perfect our administrative system, the people will cordially join you in giving it effect. In fact, under this mode, the election of a President would be removed from the people no further, than that of the Senator now is, for the people elect the members of the Legislature, and those members themselves choose the Senators. In like manner the people would elect the electors, who would choose the President, and with this difference, too, that, while the Senator holds for six years, the President would be chosen only for a single year. At least, while considering these suggestions, you may possibly be aided in finding something better, as a remedy. If the presidential term were extended to two years, under this plan, to correspond with each Congress, it might be an improvement on the present system, provided that the terms of the inferior officers were so extended, as to prevent the President's having patronage enough to render the choice a question of sufficient magnitude, to agitate the country. But if President's are annually chosen, there can be no doubt but that, with our large and increasing population, the country will furnish a sufficient number of prominent gentlemen to satisfy the demands of the Government.

Under a system through which, the several departments might, without interference with each other's duties, work harmoniously together, and so act as not to disturb the popular mind by violent agitations, there would seem to be no reason why, wise administration and public virtue, should not be maintained, for an indefinite period, in the future ages yet to be passed, in the development of a prosperous, and enlightened humanity.

Very respectfully, &c.,

T. L. CLINGMAN.

A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE
CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES IN ACCORDANCE
WITH THE PLAN ABOVE RECOMMENDED.

Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives, of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of both Houses concurring,) that the following article be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States, as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said Legislatures shall be valid, as a part of the Constitution, namely :

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. Each of the States shall by the Legislature thereof, be divided into a number of electoral districts, composed of contiguous territory, equal to the whole number of presidential electors to which such State is entitled under the existing apportionment.

SEC. 2. On the Tuesday after the first Monday in November, which shall next occur after the ratification of this amendment, provided such day shall not be less than six months after said ratification, but if the said day shall occur within six months after the said ratification, then on the next succeeding Tuesday after the first Monday in November, there shall be held throughout the United States, an election in each one of the said districts, on which day the qualified voters in each one of the said districts, shall elect one elector, to be chosen in the same manner in which members of the House of Representatives are chosen.

SEC. 3. Each one of the electors thus chosen shall, in addition to the qualification necessary to constitute a Senator of the United States, be of not less than fifty years of age, and shall at the time of his election be a resident of the said district.

SEC. 4. The acceptance of the office of elector shall immediately thereon, disqualify the said elector, and render him incapable of holding any other office, or place of trust, or profit, under the State, or under the United States, or any department thereof, while holding said position of elector, and within two years after he may have resigned said position as elector.

SEC. 5. The said elector shall be entitled to hold his office of elector during his natural life, but it may be terminated by his resignation, his ceasing to be a citizen of the State, for which he has been chosen, or by his having been convicted of a high crime, or misdemeanor, on an impeachment by the Legislature of his State, or by his having been convicted of receiving a bribe, in a court of the United States, of competent jurisdiction, to be provided by law, on which conviction as aforesaid, in addition to removal from office, he may be condemned to suffer such other punishment, as the Congress may deem best calculated to deter others from the commission of the like crime.

SEC. 6. Should a vacancy occur in any electoral district in any mode, then it shall be the duty of the Governor of that State, forthwith to order an election by proclamation, for the qualified voters in the said district to choose in the manner provided by law, an elector who shall when thus chosen, succeed to all the rights, and be subject to the disabilities of his predecessor.

SEC. 7. After each decennial apportionment, should a State be found to possess a greater number of electors than such State is entitled to under the new enumeration, then one or more of the surplus electors shall be removed by lot, or in such manner as Congress may provide.

SEC. 8. The electors thus chosen shall, on the first Wednesday in December in each and every year, assemble in the City of Washington at twelve o'clock, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, and as soon as a quorum, to consist of a majority of all elected, shall be found present, they may proceed to choose a presiding officer and Secretary, and such other officers, as they may deem necessary for the convenient dispatch of business, and decide on the qualification of their members, whose right to seats shall, *prima facie*, be determined by certificates of election from the Governors of the several States.

SEC. 9. They shall then, in open session, by a *viva voce* vote of each elector present, proceed to elect, by a majority vote, a President, and Vice-President of the United States. If within six days from the time of their organization, Sunday excepted, they shall have failed to choose a President by the vote of a majority, then the person who in the votings, first obtained a plurality over his competitors, shall be the President elect. The Vice-President shall be chosen in like manner.

SEC. 10. At the termination of the six days' session or sooner, if the election shall have been consummated, the college of electors shall be dissolved, until the period arrives for it to assemble in the succeeding year. As a compensation the members shall receive such mileage pay as may be provided by law, with a *per diem* allowance equal to the pay of a member of Congress for the like period, calculated *pro rata*, on his annual salary.

SEC. 11. The said electoral college shall, before it dissolves its session, prepare three certificates of its action, to be signed by its President and Secretary, and sealed and endorsed in presence of the college, by the signature of the President and Secretary, one of which certificates shall be sent to the President of the Senate, one to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a third to the Secretary of State.

SEC. 12. On the second Wednesday in January next ensuing, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in joint session, both certificates shall be opened by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, and with the concurrence of a majority of each House, the result of the vote shall be proclaimed by the President of the Senate.

SEC. 13. Should the two Houses differ as to the result, then it shall be the duty of the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House to certify the point or points of difference to the Supreme Court, which Court shall, in open session, on or before the first Wednesday in February, by the concurrence of a majority of its members, proclaim their decision.

SEC. 14. The person who may be proclaimed President thus, by the decision of the two Houses, or by the Supreme Court, shall, on the fourth day of March next ensuing, be inaugurated as President, unless said day should prove to be Sunday, in which event the inauguration shall take place on Monday, the fifth day of March, and the term of the preceding President shall be extended for a single day only, so that no intregnum may occur, but the President, holding prior to said fifth day of March, shall, in no event, continue in office after that day.

SEC. 15. The President, thus chosen and inaugurated, shall hold the office of President for one year only, and no person who has once held the office, or exercised the duties thereof, shall ever again, during his natural life, be eligible to the position, or capable of exercising the office a second time.

SEC. 16. The President shall be authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the members of his Cabinet as heretofore exercised, but he shall possess the right as to all other officers, only to appoint in like manner, persons to fill such offices as may become vacant during his term of office. He shall be authorized,

however, to remove any officer, he may deem dishonest, or incompetent, or negligent, and should the public exigency in his opinion require it, may temporarily authorize some other person to perform the duties of the office. He shall thereupon, report the case to the Senate with a statement of his reasons for the removal, and unless the Senate shall express its dissent at the session to which the said communication is made, the removal of said officer shall be absolute, and the person substituted may remain in office, unless the Senate shall, by its action, object thereto, in which event, it shall be the duty of the President to send into the Senate, a second nomination to fill the place.

SEC. 17. The heads of departments shall, in like manner, possess the right to remove for cause, such officers as are, or may, by law, be appointed to subordinate positions by them, but the officers thus removed for cause, may have the right to appeal to such reviewing board, as Congress may constitute, and in the event of a decision in favor of such officer, he shall be reinstated in the office, and any person temporarily filling the same, shall be discharged.

SEC. 18. It shall be the duty of Congress to designate the length of the terms for which, all officers may be appointed, except the members of the President's cabinet, and such officers as have their terms already fixed by the Constitution.

SEC. 19. It shall be the duty of Congress, while fixing the terms of the different classes of officers, to so arrange them, that a certain proportion of them shall go out in each year, so that each President shall possess the right only, to reappoint, or substitute others therefor, of a number not greater, than the proportion or ratio which, one year shall bear, to the number of years constituting the term of that class of officers.

SEC. 20. No Senator shall recommend to the President, or to any head of department, the appointment of any person for office, or take any other action therein, except to confirm, or reject such persons, as may be recommended to the Senate by the President, for appointment.

SEC. 21. Should a vacancy occur in the office of President at any time, or exist, from any cause whatever, then such vacancy, in addition to the modes of filling the same, already provided, may be filled in such manner as may be provided by law.

SEC. 22. Congress shall have power to enforce the provisions of this article by appropriate legislation, so as, in all respects, to give the utmost precision, accuracy and efficiency, to all parts of the same.

